

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CLV.]

NOVEMBER, 1818.

[Vol. XIII.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

History of Dissenting Meeting-House, Bowl-Alley Lane, Hull.

SIR, Hull, Oct. 15, 1818.

IN compliance with the suggestion of my respected friend Mr. Turner, of Newcastle, in one of your former Volumes, [VI. 166;] I send you a sketch of the History of the Dissenters' Chapel, in Bowl-Alley Lane, Hull. Such narratives, accompanied with statements of the number of regular worshippers, and other particulars respecting the *present state* of our societies, cannot fail to interest *some* of your readers, and may furnish *all* with matter for profitable reflection on the comparative merits of the different modes of conducting religious worship and instruction, which have at different periods been adopted amongst us. With warmest wishes for your success in advancing the cause of the pure gospel of Christ, I am yours, respectfully,

GEORGE KENRICK.

The Chapel in Bowl Alley, belonging to the Presbyterian Dissenters, is considerably "the oldest in the town; but of what date does not appear by any authentic record hitherto met with. Mr. Samuel Charles was chosen pastor of this congregation in 1662." See the History of Kingston-upon-Hull, by the Rev. John Tickell, 1796. The earliest formed Dissenting Society in Hull, of the origin of which any account is preserved, is the Baptists' Church in Dagger Lane, founded in 1643. As that which is the subject of this sketch is acknowledged to be of older date than this, and no account can be obtained of its origin, it seems probable that it is one of the earliest establishments of the class of Dissenters to which it belongs.

Of Mr. Charles, who was one of the ever-to-be honoured 3000 ministers who sacrificed every prospect of earthly honour, wealth and aggrandizement, for the sake of a good conscience, (whose praises will continue to resound in our churches, while our

buildings shall continue to stand or our societies to exist,) a highly interesting account is preserved in the first volume of Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, and is presented to the readers of the Repository in a somewhat abridged form, accompanied with a few observations.

Samuel Charles, M. A. of Corpus Christi Col. Cambridge, was born at Chesterfield, September 6, 1633, and ordained in 1655. After residing a few years in Sir John Gell's family at Hopton, he was presented by Sir John Curzon to the parish of Mickleover, in Derbyshire. "His early ministrations were affectionate, judicious and successful. He exercised a particular and constant watch over his own soul, especially in solemn duties, public or private." The period of his conformity to the Church must have been very short indeed, since he was chosen pastor at Hull seven years after his taking orders, and he had spent some part of the interval as a Dissenting teacher at Belper, in Derbyshire. "His principal settlements," says the Nonconformists' Memorial, "were at Belper and Hull." It appears not improbable, though not specified either by Calamy or his Editor, that Mr. Charles was one of those "many hundred ministers" who were ejected from their livings in 1660, immediately after the restoration of Charles II., "because they were in sequestrations where others had been cast out by the parliament." Introduction, p. 21.

He observed the day of his ejection from his living as a fast all his life after. He viewed conformity in such a light, as to express his persuasion, that such violence would it have done to his conscience, that if he had conformed, he could not have been saved. When he left his parsonage-house, he wrote thus in his diary: "For thy sake, O Lord, I have left my house.

So far as I can look into mine own heart, for thee only have I left houses and lands! I am sure I go out like Abraham, not knowing whither to go."

After labouring for twenty years in the ministry at the Chapel in Bowl-Alley Lane, Mr. Charles was at length imprisoned, on which occasion he writes thus in his diary: "A prisoner for Christ! Good Lord, what is this for a poor worm! Both my degrees at the University have not set me so high as when I commenced prisoner for Christ." His labours at Hull were remarkably successful; and his upright and honourable conduct procured him the respect of the magistrates of that place. But the Earl of Plymouth coming thither in the year 1682, after having been appointed governor of the place, sent for the mayor and aldermen, and with great vehemence forbade them, under pain of the loss of their charter, any longer to suffer the meetings of the Dissenters.

One of the aldermen (Duncalf) told the Earl, "by many years' observation I have found the Dissenters pious, peaceable men, and loyal subjects to their king; and, therefore, being an old man and going into another world, I will have no hand in persecuting them." Mr. Charles and Mr. Ashley (Mr. Richard Astley, according to Tickell's History, chosen pastor of the above-named Baptist Church in 1669), were, notwithstanding, sent for under the influence of the Earl's threats. The latter, having timely warning, made his escape into the country. Mr. Charles made his appearance immediately, in obedience to the summons. The following is the principal part of his own lively and instructive narrative of this interview, which may be seen in the Nonconformists' Memorial.

Mr. Charles being called before the magistrates of Hull, February 2, 1682, the following dialogue took place:—

Mr. C. I am here, my masters, in obedience to your warrant. What is your pleasure with me? But I pray you consider before you do any thing, that imprisoning the ministers of the gospel is the devil's work, and I do not think you can do his work and escape his wages.—Ald. Mr. Charles, we expected a different salutation

from you; you are to preach the gospel of peace.—Mr. C. I am so, and also the terror of the Lord to all wicked and impenitent sinners, and hard-hearted hypocrites.—Ald. You are so.—Mr. C. But, my masters, are there no malefactors in Hull, but two ministers of the gospel, Mr. Ashley and myself? Are there no drunkards, no Sabbath-breakers, no swearers?—Ald. Mr. Charles, have you taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy?—Mr. C. I am ready to take them.—Ald. Are you in holy orders according to the Church of England? Do you preach?—Mr. C. You can tell as well as I. But, gentlemen, before you pass any ugly sentence, consider the dying votes of the last Westminster Parliament of immortal honour: Resolved, "That the execution of the penal laws against Dissenting Protestants is, at this time, grievous to the subject—a furtherance to Popery—a weakening of the Protestant religion, and dangerous to the kingdom."

Ald. Do you call the execution of the king's laws an ugly work?—Mr. C. But before you execute the king's laws, (God bless him, and send him to outlive me,) I pray you hear me this one thing; there have been some persons in England, who have made as great a figure as any in Hull, who have been hanged for executing the king's laws. But if you will execute the law, pray do not outdo the law, for it is severe enough upon us.—Ald. If we do, you may look for your remedy.—Mr. C. Remedy! I had rather never be sick than be put to look for my remedy.—Ald. We did not send for you to preach to us.—Mr. C. I doubt you want one to tell you the truth.—Ald. We have a Protestant church and a Protestant ministry.—Mr. C. Long, long, long may you so have! Yet, I pray, let me acquaint you with this: the Jews had a church established by God's law, and a ministry established by law. Yet their silencing, imprisoning, and murdering a few poor fishermen, that were commissioned by the Redeemer of the world to preach the everlasting gospel, cost them so dear, that God has not done reckoning with them to this day, and it is above 1600 years ago.—Ald. It was not for silencing the apostles; it was for crucifying Christ.—Mr. C. It was so

indeed. But that did not fill up the full measure of their sin, nor bring the wrath of God upon them and their posterity to the uttermost, until they forbade the apostles to preach the gospel to the Gentiles that they might be saved. 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.—Ald. We have as learned men in the Church of England as you.—Mr. C. Yes! yes! some whose books I am not worthy to wipe the dust from.—Town Clerk. He does not speak as he thinks.—Mr. C. How can you tell that, unless you were God Almighty, the searcher of hearts, whose prerogative alone that is? I wish you had as much wisdom and honesty as the town-clerk at Ephesus had. He took the part of the blessed Apostle St. Paul: but you are very brisk against me. I pray you, gentlemen, do not judge my case, and deprive me of my liberty by a piece of the law; but let the whole act be read.—Ald. 'Tis a long act, and we must go to dinner.—One of them said 'tis a short act, a short act, let it be read. For which he had little thanks given him by some. After reading of the act, Mr. Charles said, where are the two witnesses? Let me see them *face to face*, after the manner of England, that will swear I was the parson, vicar or curate, and did refuse to give my assent and consent to take the oath, and to make the declaration, according to the Act of Uniformity.—Ald. It is no matter.—Mr. C. There must needs be proof that I am such a person as the act describes. You may as well, if you have no proof that I am the parson, vicar or curate, send for the man that next goes by in the streets, and execute the Five Mile Act upon him.—Ald. Do you think that we sit here like a company of fools? Will you take and subscribe the oath according to the act? You do preach, you do baptize, you do administer the Sacrament.—Mr. C. Did you see me?—Ald. No; but we did hear so.—Mr. C. And will you deprive a man of his liberty by hearsay? You may then find yourselves work enough, as the world goes. Upon this they ordered him to withdraw, and he was carried to the jail, and imprisoned six months.

After he was set at liberty, he continued labouring amongst his people at Hull, to the day of his death.

Mr. Charles was an "excellent scholar, well skilled in the oriental languages, and a great historian; an accurate, lively and successful preacher, indefatigably studious, retired and devout; a prudent economist, of a warm and courageous temper, and a zealous reprovcr of reigning vices." He enjoyed firm health till overtaken by the students' diseases, the stone and stranguary, which he bore with invincible patience, and of which he died Dec. 23, 1703, with great peace and comfort, and even with "assurance and triumph." His age was seventy years, forty-one of which had been spent in the exercise of the ministry at Hull.

I have in my hands, Mr. Editor, a small thick quarto volume, containing some of Mr. Charles's Sermons, taken in short-hand by Mr. Thomas Martin, grandfather of the present Mr. Martin of Hull, through whose kindness I have obtained a sight of it. The Sermons in this little collection were all preached between the years 1680 and 1695. They furnish a pleasing monument of the piety and zeal of the author, and his intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures. His sentiments are those of pretty high Calvinism.

Mr. Charles was succeeded in the year 1704, by Mr. John Billingsley, son of John Billingsley, M. A., who was ejected from the vicarage of Chesterfield. At the expiration of a year and a half, this gentleman removed to London to become assistant to Dr. Harris, in which capacity he was probably better known. He died, it seems, at an advanced age, in the year 1721. [Mon. Repos. VI. 326.]

He was succeeded in the ministry at Hull in 1705, by Mr. John Wilter, who discharged the duties of his office with zeal, fidelity and acceptance, for fifty years. He is spoken of with high respect by the very few amongst his numerous hearers who yet survive. The infirmities of age compelled him to resign in 1755, and shortly afterwards he closed a useful life by a serene and tranquil death. His picture hangs in the vestry of the chapel, and the countenance is indicative of deep penetration and close study.

It was during the ministry of this gentleman, that Mr. Leonard Chamberlain, a draper in Hull, (who had probably sat many years under the

instructions of Mr. W.'s learned and zealous predecessor Mr. Sam. Charles,) bequeathed several estates for the use of the poor, and for the purposes of education in this town and adjacent places, and his valuable library to the chapel in Bowl-Alley Lane. Mr. Chamberlain appears, if any opinion may be formed from his library, to have been a man of taste and learning. Most of the books are in the dead languages, and amongst its treasures are, Walton's Polyglott Bible, Trosius' Syriac New Testament, the works of many of the Greek and Latin Fathers, the Maittaire Classics, and several other good editions of Horace, Juvenal, Cicero, &c.; Camden's Britannia, Thoresby's Leeds, and other works in high estimation. It is evidently designed and calculated rather for the use of a minister than of the majority of the members of a religious society. The trustees of his charities are required to be members of the society in Bowl-Alley Lane. The funds are considerable, and the trustees are enabled, in fulfilment of the wishes of the testator, to contribute a small sum to the salary of the minister, £10 to the education of a student for the ministry, (at Manchester College, York,) to distribute eighteen-pence and a loaf of bread weekly, to about twenty poor persons at the chapel, to support a hospital for the aged at Sutton, three miles from Hull, and a hospital and school at Selby, of which last Rev. T. Smith is master. The will is dated 1716, and its liberal and judicious provisions may be considered as an encouraging proof of the good effects attending religious instruction.

Mr. Wilter was succeeded in the pastoral office by Mr. Titus Cordingley, about May, 1755. This amiable young man continued to hold this office only two years and a half, when he died of a decline, much lamented by his acquaintance. [Mon. Repos. V. 325, 326.]

At the end of the year 1757, he was succeeded by Mr. John Beverley, a native of York. This gentleman was educated at the University of Glasgow. He was a man of considerable learning, an elegant and interesting preacher, and an industrious student of the sacred volume. He was eminently distinguished for warm benevolence of heart and suavity of

manners, qualities which never forsook him from the first dawn of youthful vivacity, to the composed and tranquil serenity with which his evening of life was accompanied and closed. No one can say that he was ever injured by Mr. Beverley, and numbers attest, with tears of gratitude, the services they have received from him. It is not too much to say, that had he been reduced to his last six-pence, he would have shared it with the needy. It is scarcely necessary to add, that such a man was the delight of his companions, and that he secured the uniform and general respect of the town and neighbourhood in which he resided. His pulpit services were distinguished by neatness, perspicuity and simplicity, and occasionally by exhortations uncommonly affectionate, persuasive and pathetic. If ever there was an occasion when Mr. Beverley's temper rose beyond its ordinary level, it was when he had occasion to speak of Popery. When he discoursed of its gross perversions of Christian doctrine, the idolatry which it introduced into public worship, the immoral reservations and indulgences which it authorized, and its artful policy to keep the people in slavery and darkness, he seemed to lose the controul of his indignation. But his indignation was no unhallowed flame fed by party spirit; but the honest displeasure of an ingenuous and pious mind, in contemplating the best of heavenly gifts perverted to the worst of purposes, by the passions and worldly-mindedness of men. His sentiments were Unitarian, but his was the office of the pioneer to the army of truth; preparing the way, by removing prejudices and smoothing asperities, for bolder and more unequivocal declarations of Unitarianism in more recent times.

His familiar intercourse with mankind was marked with the gentleness of the lamb. His customary reply, in the latter part of his life, to inquirers after his health, "going gently down the vale," is remembered by many, and was no less characteristic of the temper with which he past through life, than of the gradual and almost imperceptible decline with which he retired from it. His picture hangs in the vestry.

He resigned the pastoral office in

the year 1799, after a ministry of forty-two years; but continued to exemplify his own instructions in the eyes of his flock until the year 1812. [Mon. Repos. V. 477, and VII. 533—535.] His remains were attended to their repository, in the chapel, by his congregation and many of the most respectable persons in the town. A neat monumental tablet is placed on the left-hand side of the pulpit, with the following inscription:

As a testimony
Of their respect and veneration for his
character,
This Monument is erected to the memory of
The Rev. John Beverley,
By this congregation, of which
He was upwards of forty years the faithful
And affectionate pastor.
He died on the 27th day of May, 1812,
In the 79th year of his age,
Leaving a name
Unsullied by the whisper of calumny,
After a long and lingering illness,
Which he bore with humility and
Resignation, characteristic
Of his holy life, and truly edifying
To all who knew him.
The remembrance of the just is sweet.

Shortly after the resignation of Mr. Beverley, the choice of the congregation fell on Mr. Wm. Oke Manning, eldest son of Mr. Manning, of Exeter. But Mr. M. having another session to spend at the College at Manchester, the Society thought themselves peculiarly fortunate in engaging in the interval the services of Mr. George Lee, who removed to Hull, from Belper, in Derbyshire, at this time.

During the ministry of Mr. Manning, it was discovered that the building was so far infected with the dry rot, that it was necessary to pull it down. The present structure was raised on the same site, and opened in the month of September, 1803. It is an octagon, capable of seating about 650 persons, and is an uncommonly neat and commodious building. After remaining about five years in the pastoral office, Mr. Manning quitted Hull in 1805, to enter into business in London, leaving behind him a high character for benevolence and gentlemanly deportment. Mr. Lee, at the solicitation of the Society, again officiated for a few months, and in 1806, Mr. Severn, of Kidderminster, was chosen pastor. This gentleman

had, in early life, been one of John Wesley's preachers, who had often been heard to lament the loss of so valuable a servant by his conversion to Unitarianism. To his early studies, under so great a master, was to be attributed that talent for religious conversation by which he was distinguished. He was an occasional Correspondent of the Monthly Repository, under the signature Sabrina, to which work, I believe, I may refer your readers for a further account of him. [VIII. 550, 551.] He was distinguished by probity and simplicity of character. His heart, in the words of one who knew him well, "was as pure as a child's." He published, while at Hull, a pamphlet, entitled "Diversity of Sects no valid Argument against the Truth of the Christian Religion," &c. [Mon. Repos. V. 256, 257.]

He died suddenly in the month of June, 1813, and reposes in a vault in the chapel, by the side of his predecessor, Mr. Beverley, just under the spot from which their successors are to proclaim that gospel, against which the "gates of the grave shall not prevail."

On the right-hand side of the pulpit is a monumental tablet, corresponding to the one above-mentioned, bearing the following inscription:

In memory of
The Rev. William Severn,
Whose mortal part lies interred in the
aisle below,
This Tablet is erected by his affectionate
widow, as a
Memorial of her esteem and affection.
During seven years,
Mr. Severn performed the duties of Minister to
This congregation,
With zeal and punctuality, with probity,
benevolence
And piety, never excelled.
A fit of apoplexy suddenly finished his
career
On the 22d day of June, 1813,
In the 59th year of his age,
Whilst he was taking his usual
Evening's walk.

What he was, the day will declare.

After this mournful event, Mr. Lee's valuable services were again called for, and afforded during a year and a half; at the expiration of which time, the writer of the present article came hither from Chesterfield. This connexion commenced with the beginning of the year 1815.

About twenty-five years ago, the chapel in Bowl-Alley Lane was attended by a very numerous congregation, consisting of the most respectable families in the town; but their numbers suffered great diminution at the close of the century. Several of the representatives of wealthy families, whose names stand in the register as having been baptized by the minister, have now forsaken the house in which their ancestors had long worshiped. The number of constant attendants has not, for some years past, exceeded one hundred and fifty. But amongst them a considerable de-

gree of religious inquiry goes on. Sunday schools, for all denominations, were established in April last, in which about fifty children are instructed. Most of the younger members are engaged as voluntary teachers, and the older members as visitors and contributors. The books in the library, particularly the modern publications, added to it principally during the ministry of Mr. Severn, are much read. But the object which excites most interest, is, the new Unitarian Association, from which extensive benefits are anticipated.

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LOCKE AND
LIMBORCH, TRANSLATED,
WITH HISTORICAL NOTES.

*The Correspondence between Locke and
Limborch, 1685—1704.*

(Continued from p. 612.)

No. 32.

John Locke to Philip à Limborch.

Oates, March 4, 1697.

MY WORTHY FRIEND,

BETWEEN public business and my own indifferent health, I enjoy so small a portion of literary leisure, that I must trust to your consideration towards your friends, to excuse my too long silence, which, however, has not been occasioned by the least diminution of good-will and regard. I will not inquire whether you or I wrote last. It is sufficient that I feel myself culpable, for having been so long without the advantage of your most agreeable correspondence. It seemed, indeed, to me a great and lamentable chasm in the course of my life, when our correspondence being interrupted, I was destitute of that highest of all gratifications which is derived from the affectionate intercourse of friends. Attention to my infirm health, occupied me in the country during all the past winter, except when some urgent business frequently intruded and snatched away the time which I might have devoted to my friends. I know not what else to say to yourself or many other friends, or how I can otherwise save my reputation, if they

have attributed my silence to neglect. You, I know, are too kind to impute to me that offence. For though my pen is sometimes rather tardy in replying, yet my mind is not indifferent; and if I take this freedom, it is only with those with whom I would cultivate not only civility, but sincere and intimate friendship, those to whom I acknowledge that I owe much, and to whom I greatly desire to be more indebted.

Going lately to London, after suffering, during eight days, from shortness of breath, I was forced to return hither for recovery. This weakness of lungs, will, I hope, soon restore me to my former leisure. For what has an aged valetudinarian to offer his country besides his good wishes? All must yield to nature's decay. If here I can have books and the correspondence of friends, the employments which have been suspended, or at least interrupted, those best alleviations of old age will be resumed. For, amidst public engagements, there is scarcely leisure to inquire what is going forward in the Republic of Letters.

Among us, too many writers waste their ink in strife and bickering. If the warmth of the disputants were excited solely by a love of truth, the ardour and energy of their debates would be worthy of praise. But their arguments are not always so managed that you can give them credit for a

predominant desire to explain and establish the truth.

In my *Essay on the Human Understanding*, something is, at last, found out which is not quite sound, and which has been objected to by men of no common rank.* Should I discover any errors on considering their arguments, I shall gratefully acknowledge and readily correct them. On the other hand, I ought to give my reasons why I adhere to my opinion when I cannot discover it to be contrary to truth. My Defence† employed me part of last winter, as health would allow. But why do I detain you with our trifles? I wish to know what you and your friends are doing, who are occupied with more important studies. How shameful is the demand of a speedy reply from you, when I have been so dilatory! But I know you will gratify me, lest you should seem too seriously to avenge yourself for my delay.

Farewell, my excellent friend, and still regard me as you have made me,

Most respectfully yours,

J. LOCKE.

No. 33.

Philip à Limborch to John Locke.

Amsterdam, March 26, 1697.‡

MY WORTHY FRIEND,

I SHOULD sooner have answered your letter, which did not reach me till the 15th of October; but as you asked my opinion of the English work translated into French, § I waited for sufficient leisure to read the whole of that elegant treatise, that I might attentively consider its contents, in their connexion. This winter season appeared peculiarly favourable to my design, when we are generally re-

lieved from academical engagements, but the severity of the cold interposed no small impediment to writing. I have read, however, the whole treatise from beginning to end, nor could I be satisfied without a second perusal.

In the mean time we have received here the *Acts of Leipsic* for the month of October, in which there is an abstract of that treatise, after the manner of those Doctors. First, they say the name of the author is *Pockins*, hastily trusting, I fancy, to uncertain rumour, and mistaking one letter in the name. Then, they are careful to bring into the abstract every thing which seems calculated to excite prejudice against the author, that they may thus appear to avenge the contempt poured on systems of theology. They highly extol John Edwards* for having distinguished himself by various controversial writings against the Socinian heresy, and having published a volume of *Thoughts concerning the Causes and Occasions of Atheism*, [1695,] especially in the present day. In this book he is continually glancing at the opinions of that anonymous author, as pernicious, and not far from Socinianism and Atheism. They have subjoined an abstract of two works, one of which is a short apology for the aforesaid treatise; the other is by John Edwards, and entitled *Socinianism Unmasked*.† You must be bet-

* "A Divine of the Church of England," son of the virulent Presbyterian Edwards, the author of *Gangrena*. He died in 1716, aged 78. See *Biog. Brit.* V. 543—546.

† "Or the Unreasonableness of the Opinion concerning one Article of Faith only." He also published "A Brief Vindication of the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith," and "The Socinian Creed," 1696 and 1697. These, with some part of the treatise on Atheism, were "occasioned by Mr. Locke's publication of *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, as delivered in the Scriptures, and by the writings of some professed Socinians. Mr. Edwards was the first person that encountered, what he apprehended to be Mr. Locke's dangerous notions of the one sole article of faith. Our author's writings against Mr. Locke, have sunk into total neglect, while *The Reasonableness of Christianity* still continues to be read." *Ibid.* 545, Note. See Locke's *Vindication* and

* "Dr. Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, in his *Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, published in 1697." See *Brit. Biog.* VII. 14, 15, 57.

† "A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Worcester," dated Oates, Jan. 7, 1697.

‡ This Letter, dated according to the N. S. appears to have been written before No. 32, had been received.

§ See p. 610, col. 1. This translation, entitled *Christianisme Raisonné*, was republished in 1715, in two volumes, 12mo. See *Nouv. Dict. Hist. art. Locke*, 1772, IV. 131.

ter acquainted with these treatises than I can be. They appear to regret that the *Thoughts* of Edwards have not come to their hands. Of that they have only an abstract, but they have received the other book.

You know that I have written a *System of Theology*,* yet systems are not so prized by me, but that I prefer this small treatise to many systems; freely confessing that I have thence derived more sound divinity than from the systems of numerous writers. But that author teaches a theology far too gentle and liberal; while he scruples to confine salvation within the narrow bounds of human decisions, and maintains, not the orthodoxy of the creeds of sects, but of the word of God. Such a crime the systematic Doctors are sure to punish by a discreditable imputation of Socinianism and Atheism; as if they who conscientiously refuse to reverence human decisions, were to be regarded as thus abjuring religion itself.

I very much approve the design of the author in that treatise. This, I think, he has happily pursued, and fully proved his point. Two things especially please me—the correct sketch of the evangelical history, in the ninth chapter, by which several passages in the gospels, apparently obscure, are satisfactorily explained—and that luminous deduction of arguments, by which it appears why our Lord Jesus Christ, while on earth, never expressly taught that he was the Messiah. These are peculiar to this author, and clearly discover his judgment and ingenuity. But there are many other passages which strongly confirm the principal argument of his book, that a belief in Jesus, as the Christ, is the faith which justifies. You have here my opinion of that treatise, which I have resolved to read a third time.

But you ask me to send you any remarks which have occurred to me in reading that treatise. The whole is so excellent that I know not what to propose, worthy of animadversion. It has so fully my assent, that the remarks I have made are only on a very

few points, which detract nothing from the principal design, and, perhaps, I have misunderstood them. Yet as you require my opinion, I propose to you these considerations, such as they are, not because they are of any moment, but to comply with your desire:—

Just at the beginning the author says, *that the doctrine of redemption is founded upon the supposition of Adam's fall*. It is indeed certain, that the fall of Adam is not excluded from the doctrine of redemption; yet neither are every one's own sins thus excluded. The opinion of many of the learned is, that our Lord Jesus Christ has delivered us from the misery into which we fell by the sin of Adam, and restored us to the same state of happiness which we lost in Adam. These appear to me to undervalue the immense benefit we receive from Christ, who has delivered us from *many offences*, as the apostle speaks, Rom. v., and introduced us to a far happier condition, even to *eternal life* in heaven.

I also find there this opinion, that Adam, by sin, lost immortality and became mortal.* If by immortality the author intends that if Adam had not sinned, he would not have died; and by mortality, that through sin he incurred the necessity of dying, his opinion I think very just. But if immortality, as the word strictly signifies, mean the impossibility of his dying, I cannot think it is correct to say that Adam was created immortal. I have fully explained my opinion in my *Christian Theology*, B. ii. Ch. xxiv. For this immortality, or immunity from death, is plainly of a different nature from the immortality of God; just as mortality or a liability to death differs widely from death or a necessity of dying. Wherefore, it seems to me to be said rather improperly, p. 230, that Adam's immortality was like that of God, after which it was formed.† And though it must be

* "The state of paradise was a state of immortality, of life without end, which he lost that very day that he eat." *Works*, fol. ed. 4, p. 507.

† "Adam, being the son of God, had this part also, of the likeness and image of his Father, that he was immortal." *Ibid.* p. 558.

his *Second Vindication*, both published in 1696.

* See p. 478, col. 1, Note.

admitted, that immortality is elsewhere described as a likeness of God, yet it does not thence follow, when Adam is said to be formed after the image of God, that the image was immortality: for every thing which the Scripture designs by the image of God, is not necessarily intended, when man is said to be formed in the image of God. It is sufficient that there be some excellent quality in man, for which he is said to bear the image of God. Among other places I see, p. 232, a reference to Romans viii. 29, where the foreknown and predestinated by God, are said to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. The author supposes immortality and eternal life to be intended by the image to which we must be conformed.* I, however, conclude, that not so much eternal life is here intended, as the way to attain it, in which the faithful are to resemble Christ, namely, by afflictions and the cross; which resemblance our Lord points out to his disciples, Luke xxiv. 26: *Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?* The connexion of the chapter confirms this sense, for he had said, ver. 17, we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. And it is remarkable, that, on that occasion, the faithful are exhorted to bear the cross and afflictions for the sake of the gospel, and are urged among other arguments by the Divine will, which purposes to bring us to salvation by the cross. And lest they should deem it rigorous for God to send so many evils in this world upon those whom he loves, he proposes to them the example of Christ, unto whose image God had predestined them to be conformed, and consequently called them to endure the cross. And, in the sequel, he further shews them, that those afflictions, by which they were united to Christ, could not possibly separate them from the love of God. The Scripture here, and in many other places, declares, that if we would be partakers of Christ's glory we must, like him, endure the cross, 2 Tim. ii.

11, 12, and especially Heb. ii. 10: *For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.* And by this argument he specially exhorts the faithful to the patient endurance of persecution. 1 Pet. iv. 12, 13; Heb. xii. 1, 2, 3. This, I believe, to be the image of Christ, to which the apostle says that God has predestinated us to be conformed, Rom. viii. 29, with which agrees what we read, Acts xiv. 22, 2 Tim. iii. 12.

The author remarks, p. 246, that he has not met with any instance in which the Lord Jesus "assumes to himself the title of Priest, or mentions any thing relating to his priesthood."* The priestly office of Christ is certainly revealed to us in the apostolic Epistles, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews. And though it must be admitted, that the Lord Jesus nowhere in the gospels claims the title of priest, yet it cannot be denied that he sometimes claims to act as a priest; for he says expressly, that he was about to give his life, *λύτρον ἀντιπολλῶν*, Matt. xx. 28. He calls his blood the blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the remission of sins, Matt. xxvi. 28. We cannot deny that this had reference to the priesthood. Wherefore it were, perhaps, better to omit this, and not supply an occasion for the cavils of those who are ever disposed to calumniate.

Besides these, I have met with other things in that treatise, which appear scarcely consistent, as, probably, the author has not fully explained himself. He says, p. 13, "Adam being thus turned out of paradise, and all his posterity born out of it, the consequence of it was, that all men should die and remain under death for ever, and so be utterly lost. From this estate of death," he says, "Jesus Christ restores all mankind to life," and this by the law of faith, which afterwards he fully proves to be contained in the gospel.† These things, in my judgment, are truly said; but I cannot clearly understand how they agree with what we meet

* Works, p. 559.

* Works, p. 562. † Ibid. p. 509.

with, pp. 250 and 266, that they who are righteous do not depend on favour, but have "a right to the tree of life:"* for they, being the posterity of Adam also, would alike continue for ever under the power of death. How, therefore, could such acquire by their righteousness, a right to the tree of life so as to need no favour, since it was before laid down, that all were delivered from that condition of unavoidable death, and this by the law of faith? Whence it seems to follow, that such deliverance could be obtained only by a law of faith; therefore not by perfect obedience to the law of works; for, to deliver from misery, is of favour, which is excluded by the law of works. Nor upon that principle can it be satisfactorily explained how, as the author describes, they can be saved who never heard of Christ.† For, if through Adam they be necessarily obnoxious to eternal death, from which, by a law of faith alone, through the grace of Christ, they are delivered, it seems insufficient that, by the light of nature, they have some faint glimmerings of the faith that God is merciful. Their salvation, it seems, should rather depend on that law of faith which God has fixed as the condition of salvation. I observe that the systematic Doctors are much offended with this part; and are not satisfied with those five advantages‡ which, according to the author, the advent of the Lord Jesus procured for mankind. I agree that nothing should be advanced to the prejudice of the truth for the sake of conciliating the systematic Doctors; and whatever they allege unreasonably should, in my opinion, be rejected with indignation. Yet it deserves consideration, whether such language ought not to be used as, though it fail to satisfy them, may possibly give less offence, and, in my judgment, afford a more exact definition of the truth. I observe, indeed, that the influence of the prophetic and kingly office of

Christ is described, but not of his sacerdotal. What, therefore, if here were added the influence of his sacerdotal office; that thus the world became reconciled to God, so that now through Christ there is provided for all men, every where, a way of recovery from that misery into which they had fallen by the sin of Adam and their own sins, and of attaining eternal salvation? This doctrine being established, it may, I think, be shewn, according to the principles of salvation before laid down, how they who never heard of Christ may be saved by him; namely, because God (as this author says, p. 292,*) applies the grace procured by Christ, and imputes, on account of Christ, remission of sins and righteousness to those who, by the instinct of the light of nature, fly to his grace and compassion, repent of their sins and implore their pardon. And thus the benefit which, where Christ is preached, cannot be obtained without proper faith in him, they obtain without such faith, since he has not been preached to them, through a gracious divine imputation; for God can extend his bounteous mercies far beyond the literal sense of his promises. Thus the salvation of all is procured by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. Such views appear to me not very different from those of this author, and agreeable to the gospel doctrine.

The last chapter I highly approve,† being convinced that all which respects the belief and practice necessary to salvation, is contained in the Gospels and the Acts, and that no new article is added in the Epistles. For, what some have represented as new articles of faith are not so; but either clearer explications of articles before delivered, or vindications of a doctrine already taught, from objections, chiefly those of the Jews. Of this we have a striking example in the Epistle to the Romans.

Such are the few things which have occurred in my reading, and which I

* *Works*, pp. 563, 567.

† *Ibid.* pp. 569, 570.

‡ "The knowledge of one God—a clear knowledge of duty—reformation in the outward forms of worshiping the Deity—great encouragement to a virtuous and pious life—the promise of assistance." *Ibid.* pp. 573—581.

* *Works*, p. 572.

† *Ultimum Caput per omnia amplector.* The English Treatise is not divided into chapters; but Limborch refers to the concluding paragraphs which follow the enlargement on the five advantages. See *Ibid.* pp. 581—585.

submit to your consideration. I have, probably, failed in some places to comprehend fully the author's meaning. These are, however, inconsiderable, and beside the author's principal design, which he appears to me to have accomplished by a course of arguments quite unexceptionable, so that he has engaged my almost unqualified assent. I especially commend him for so clearly and candidly, nor less solidly, demonstrating the necessity of repentance and good works, and shewing how the law of faith has not repealed, though it has mitigated the law of works. I cannot approve their divinity who teach, that, even before any act of repentance, we are justified in the sight of God, through the faith by which we apply to ourselves the merits of Christ. Thoughtless men, when full of this persuasion, even in the midst of their wickedness, readily account themselves justified and saved, if they appear to have faith, however wavering. Careless teachers also are apt to encourage this rash confidence, not scrupling to pronounce, without any hesitation, the salvation of the profane and vicious, if, in their last moments, they have only professed a firm reliance on the merits of Christ.

I add a recent example in this city which ought not to be passed over. Last summer, a maid-servant, that she might rob her master's house, set it on fire in the night. She was capitally convicted, and, at her execution, largely, and in very strong language, professed her faith in the merits of Christ, to the clergyman who attended her. He not only gave the criminal the most undoubted assurance of salvation, but also in his sermon, on the following day, warmly commended her faith to the congregation. He, indeed, did not scruple to declare, that, the public shame only excepted, he could wish so to end his life. Many applauded, though some (not only Remonstrants, but also Contra-Remonstrants), could not refrain from expressing their indignation against the encomium of such an encomiast.

At length I must conclude. With your usual kindness you will pardon my prolixity.

Farewell, my most worthy and ever respected friend.

Yours, affectionately,
P. à LIMBORCH.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Brande's Estimate of Dr. Priestley's Chemical Discoveries.

[In volume I. 216—219 and 328—334, we inserted Mons. Cuvier's "Eulogy on Dr. Priestley," pronounced in the French National Institute. The reader will there see in what estimation Dr. Priestley is held amongst foreign philosophers. We have now the satisfaction of adding to that tribute to his memory, another by one of the first English chemists of the present day. It is the more valuable, as it is in the form of historical and philosophical criticism. We extract it from "A Dissertation, exhibiting a General View of the Progress of Chemical Philosophy, from the Early Ages to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By William Thomas Brande, Secretary of the Royal Society of London, Fellow of

the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Professor of Chemistry in the Royal Institution of Great Britain, and Professor of Chemistry and Materia Medica to the Society of Apothecaries in the City of London." Prefixed to Vol. III. of Supplement to Encyclopædia Britannica. 4to. Pp. 48—61. It will be borne in mind by the reader, that Mr. Brande professes to ascertain Dr. Priestley's merits in *only one* branch of philosophy. Ed.]

OF the various discoveries, which it is the object of this Dissertation to unfold, none have been more important in their consequences than those relating to the composition of atmospheric air, a subject which the ancients seem not to have thought upon, since they regarded it as an element or ultimate principle of matter. In this, as in most other branches

of experimental science, the advances of the human mind have been very gradual: Mayow, in 1674, was upon the very brink of that stream of discovery, which, in 1774, carried Dr. Priestley into the fastnesses of Pneumatic Chemistry. Hales, by shewing the mode of disengaging and collecting gaseous fluids, removed many of the most serious obstacles which encumbered this path of research; he was followed by Boerhaave, and afterwards by Black, who, having reached the discovery of fixed air, turned into another road of investigation. Neither Mayow, therefore, nor Hales, nor Boerhaave, nor Black, were very diligent cultivators of Pneumatic Chemistry: they had, indeed, opened the mine, but did not explore it; its treasures were reserved for those whose labours we are now about to recount, and were chiefly borne away by the diligent dexterity of Dr. Joseph Priestley.

If we trust the quotations of Rey already cited, the necessity of air, in the process of combustion, was not only observed, but inquired into by Cæsalpinus* and Libavius,† as far back as the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth century. Mayow insisted that a part only of the atmosphere was concerned in the phenomena of combustion, and found that air in which bodies had burned became unfit for the respiration of animals. As soon as it had been ascertained that, in the phenomena of combustion and respiration, a portion of fixed air was generated, the extinction of burning bodies, and the death of animals immersed in air, thus rendered foul, were referred to the presence of that gaseous body, its noxious qualities having been amply

proved by Black and others; and this opinion seemed to be sanctioned by the discovery, that air thus tainted by respiration and combustion, might, in some measure, be restored to purity by exposure to the action of lime water, which absorbed the fixed air.

In 1772, Dr. Rutherford, Professor of Botany in the University of Edinburgh, published a thesis on fixed, or, as it was then called, mephitic air, from which the following passage is extracted: "By the respiration of animals, healthy air is not merely rendered mephitic, but also suffers another change. For, after the mephitic portion is absorbed by a caustic alkaline lixivium, the remaining portion is not rendered salubrious, and although it occasions no precipitate in lime water, it nevertheless extinguishes flame, and destroys life."

Thus we have traced the discovery of two gaseous fluids differing from common air: fixed air, discovered by Black, and *azote*, as it has since been called, by Rutherford. The former, a component part of chalk, and of the mild alcalis, the product of the combustion of charcoal, and of the respiration of animals; the latter an ingredient of atmospheric air.

It would be a wearisome and unprofitable occupation to record, even in brief terms, the transactions of a set of cavilling philosophers who started up in this country, and elsewhere, about the present period of our history; their names have sunk into oblivion, and their works were only read while recommended by novelty. Some of them I have reluctantly perused, and have found that they are rather calculated to weary the attention than to satisfy curiosity, or impart information.

I, therefore, hasten to one of the most remarkable and splendid epochs of chemical science, adorned by discoveries which have been rarely equalled, either in number or importance, and ushered in by a series of sterling facts and memorable investigations. The well-known names of Priestley, Scheele, Cavendish and Lavoisier, now appear upon the stage, and it will be an arduous but gratifying task to follow them through their respective parts. In this recital, a strict adherence to the dates of discoveries would neither be convenient

* Born at Arezzo in 1519; died at Rome in 1603. His medical works contain some scattered chemical observations, which, however, are of little importance.

† Libavius has sometimes been cited as the most rational chemical inquirer of his age, but of this character I can find no justification in his writings upon chemical subjects; they are either unintelligible or trifling; he certainly had some merit as a contriver of apparatus, and his furnaces and distillatory vessels appear to have been ingeniously devised.

He died in 1616.

nor useful, and I shall rather, therefore, deviate a little on this point, than cloud the perspicuity of my narrative, or cramp it by chronological strictness.

Dr. Priestley's character was of so composite an order as to defy brief description or superficial delineation; he was a politician, a divine, a metaphysician and a philosopher; and in each of these callings he displayed abilities of a peculiar and occasionally exalted description. His copious and important contributions to chemical science are the more surprising, when it is remembered that his philosophical pursuits were merely resorted to as a relaxation in his theological studies; that his mind was under the constant agitation of controversy and dispute; that he was too impatient for deep research, and too hasty for premeditated plans. But, with all these bars against him, he was a thriving wooer of science: he made more of his time than any person of whom I ever read or heard; and possessed the happy and rare talent of passing from study to amusement, and from amusement to study, without occasioning any retrograde movement in the train and connexion of his thoughts.

There is another important feature in Dr. Priestley's character, which may tend to throw some light upon his controversy with the French school: he possessed the strictest literary and scientific honesty; he makes frequent mention of his predecessors and contemporaries, and enumerates the ideas which he borrowed from them, and the experiments they suggested with more than necessary accuracy and minuteness. His attachment to chemistry seems to have been formed at Leeds, about the year 1768, and between that period and the year 1772 he had added several new and highly important facts to the science, which are detailed in a long communication presented to the Royal Society in the spring of that year. It is here that he relates those researches respecting the influence of vegetation upon the atmosphere, which led to entirely new views of the physiology of plants, and which displayed, in a striking light, some of those masterly and beneficent adjustments of nature, by which the different members of the creation are

made to minister to each other's wants, and thus preserve that eternal harmony which marks the natural world.

As combustion and respiration were connected with the deterioration of air, it occurred to Dr. Priestley to ascertain how far the growth of vegetables might be productive of similar effects.

"One might have imagined," says he, "that since common air is necessary to vegetable as well as to animal life, both plants and animals would affect it in the same manner; and I own I had that expectation when I first put a sprig of mint into a glass jar, standing inverted in a vessel of water; but when it had continued growing there for some months, I found that the air would neither extinguish a candle, nor was it at all inconvenient to a mouse which I put into it."

In experiments of this kind, Dr. Priestley points out the necessity of often withdrawing the dead and dying leaves, lest, by their putrefaction, they should injure the air; he also hints at the noxious powers of some plants, especially the cabbage, of which he kept a leaf in a glass of air for one night only, and in the morning a candle would not burn in it.

Dr. Priestley also extended his experiments to the influence of plants upon air vitiated by animal respiration and by combustion, and found that they in general did not only not contaminate the air, but that they actually restored to purity that which had been rendered impure by flame and breathing; and by shewing that this change was effected by groundsel as perfectly as by mint, proved it independent of the aromatic oil to which some in their ignorance had been willing to refer it.

That actual vegetation was necessary, and the mere vegetable insufficient, he proved by exposing the pulled leaves of a mint plant to air, which were unproductive of the regeneration effected by the growing sprig.

Dr. Priestley concluded from these experiments, that the noxious air resulting from combustion, and from the breathing of the different animal tribes, formed part of the nourishment of plants; and that the purity of our

atmosphere, and its fitness for respiration, were materially dependent upon the functions of growing vegetables.

Mayow, in 1674, and Hales, in 1724, had observed the production of gaseous matter during the action of nitric acid upon the metals. I have before alluded to the very rude manner in which Mayow collected it. Hales ascertained its singular property of producing red fumes when mixed with common air. Dr. Priestley resumed these inquiries, and pursued them with clever activity: he found, that, on mixing one hundred parts, by measure, of common air, with one hundred of the air procured by the action of nitrous acid on copper, which he called nitrous gas, red fumes were produced, and there was a diminution of bulk equal to ninety-two parts in the two hundred; so that one hundred and eight parts only remained.

When fixed air was thus mixed with nitrous air, there was no diminution; when air, contaminated by combustion or respiration, was used, the diminution was less than with purer air; and with air taken from different situations, Dr. Priestley thought he obtained rather variable results. Hence the beautiful application of nitrous air to the discovery of the fitness of other species of air, for combustion and respiration.

It was for these discoveries that the Council of the Royal Society honoured Dr. Priestley by the presentation of Sir Godfrey Copley's medal, on the 30th of November, 1783, [1778].*

* "Sir Godfrey Copley originally bequeathed five guineas to be given at each anniversary meeting of the Royal Society, by the determination of the president and council, to the person who had been the author of the best paper of experimental observation for the past year. In process of time, this pecuniary reward, which could never be an important consideration to a man of enlarged and philosophical mind, however narrow his circumstances might be, was changed into the more liberal form of a gold medal, in which form it is become a truly honourable mark of distinction, and a just and laudable object of ambition. It was, no doubt, always usual with the Presidents, on the delivery of the medal, to pay some compliment to the gentleman on whom it was bestowed, but the custom of making a set speech on the occasion,

Sir John Pringle, who was then president, delivered, on this occasion, an elaborate and elegant discourse upon the different kinds of air, in which, after expatiating upon the discoveries of his predecessors, he points out the especial merits of Priestley's investigations. In allusion to the purification of a tainted atmosphere by the growth of plants, the president has thus expressed himself:

"From these discoveries we are assured, that no vegetable grows in vain; but that, from the oak of the forest to the grass of the field, every individual plant is serviceable to mankind; if not always distinguished by some private virtue, yet making a part of the whole which cleanses and purifies our atmosphere. In this the fragrant rose and deadly nightshade co-operate; nor is the herbage nor the woods that flourish in the most remote and unpeopled regions unprofitable to us, nor we to them, considering how constantly the winds convey to them our vitiated air, for our relief and for their nourishment. And if ever these salutary gales rise to storms and hurricanes, let us still trace and revere the ways of a beneficent Being, who not fortuitously, but with design, not in wrath, but in mercy, thus shakes the water and the air together, to bury in the deep those putrid and pestilential effluvia which the vegetables on the face of the earth had been insufficient to consume."†

and of entering into the history of that part of philosophy to which the experiment related, was first introduced by Mr. Martin Folkes. The discourses, however, which he and his successors delivered, were very short, and were only inserted in the minute books of the Society; none of them had ever been printed before Sir John Pringle was raised to the chair of the Society." *Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary.—Life of Pringle.*

† Dr. Franklin, in a letter upon the subject of this discovery to Dr. Priestley, has expressed himself as follows:

"That the vegetable creation should restore the air which is spoiled by the animal part of it, looks like a rational system, and seems to be of a piece with the rest. Thus, fire purifies water all the world over. It purifies it by distillation when it rains it in vapours, and lets it fall in rain; and farther still by filtration, when, keeping it fluid, it suffers that rain to percolate the

Such were Dr. Priestley's researches, and such the views to which he had been led previous to the year 1775, when he undertook the examination of the air which rises from red lead, and from red precipitate of quicksilver, when those substances are ex-

posed to heat. This, indeed, was one of the topics upon which Hales had touched before him, but it was passed over with that hasty and superficial carelessness of which his experimental proceedings furnish so many instances, and in which he so often lost the substance by grasping at the shadow.

earth. We knew before that putrid animal substances were converted into sweet vegetables when mixed with the earth and applied as manure; and now, it seems that the same putrid substances, mixed with the air, have a similar effect. The strong thriving state of your mint, in putrid air, seems to shew that the air is mended by taking something from it, and not by adding to it. I hope this will give some check to the rage of destroying trees that grow near houses, which has accompanied our late improvements in gardening, from an opinion of their being unwholesome. I am certain, from long observation, that there is nothing unhealthy in the air of woods; for we Americans have every where our country habitations in the midst of woods, and no people on earth enjoy better health, or are more prolific." *Phil. Trans.* 1772, page 199.

Notwithstanding these researches, which have exposed some very curious facts relative to the chemical physiology of plants, it must be confessed that the causes of the renovation and equality of our atmosphere are yet by no means ascertained; for, although some growing vegetables do, under certain circumstances, purify the air, (by the absorption of carbon and the evolution of oxygen,) yet, when in a state of decay, they invariably add to its contamination, and a general view of the subject would induce us to conclude, that they do as much harm as good, at least, if recent experiments connected with this subject are to be considered as correct.

These are the prominent features of Dr. Priestley's first communication to the Royal Society respecting the different kinds of air, and had he bestowed no other contribution upon chemistry, the facts here detailed would have entitled him to a conspicuous place among the benefactors of the science. The paper is divided into several sections, in which he discusses the nature and properties of fixed air; of the air contaminated by the combustion of candles and of brimstone; of inflammable air; of air infected with animal respiration or putrefaction; of air exposed to the action of mixtures of iron filings and sulphur; of nitrous air; of air in which metals have been calcined, and which has been exposed to the action of white-lead paint; and of air procured by spirit of salt.

Dr. Priestley cast his keenest eye upon the prospect now before him, and as the various objects came into view, he followed them up with more than his ordinary diligence and usual sagacity. The track he had entered upon was, indeed, of such abundant promise, as would have ensnared the attention and excited the curiosity of one less awake than our author to its interest and novelty. But he, already well initiated in the management of æiform fluids, proceeded with a rapidity which left his associates far behind, and carried him, in proud and undisputed precedence, to the goal of discovery.

The 1st of August, 1774, is a red-letter day in the annals of Chemical Philosophy, for it was then that Dr. Priestley discovered dephlogisticated air. Some, sporting in the sunshine of rhetoric, have called this the birthday of Pneumatic Chemistry; but it was even a more marked and memorable period; it was then (to pursue the metaphor) that this branch of the science, having eked out a sickly and infirm infancy in the ill-managed nursery of the early chemists, began to display symptoms of an improving constitution, and to exhibit the most hopeful and unexpected marks of future importance.

Dr. Priestley's original opinion, that all kinds of factitious air were noxious, seems first to have been shaken by observing that a candle would burn in air procured by distilling nitre in a gun barrel; but the first experiment, which led to a very satisfactory result, was conducted as follows: A glass jar was filled with quicksilver, and inverted in a basin of the same; some red precipitate of quicksilver was then introduced, and floated upon the quicksilver in the jar; heat was applied to it in this situation by a burning lens, and "I presently found that air was expelled from it very readily. Having got about three or four times as much as the bulk of my materials, I

admitted water into it, and found that it was not imbibed by it. But what surprised me more than I can well express, was, that a candle burned in this air with a remarkably vigorous flame, very much like that enlarged flame with which a candle burns in nitrous air, exposed to iron or liver of sulphur; but, as I had got nothing like this remarkable appearance from any kind of air besides this peculiar modification of nitrous air, and I knew no nitrous acid was used in the preparation of *mercurius calcinatus*, I was utterly at a loss how to account for it."*

He afterwards obtained the same kind of air by exposing red lead and several other substances to heat, and made a number of well-devised experiments upon its properties.

Those who, for the first time, witness the effect of this air upon burning bodies, will best picture to themselves the emotion and surprise of its discoverer, when he plunged a burning taper into it. The splendour of the flame was magnificently increased, the consumption of the wax was extremely rapid, and the heat evolved much more considerable than in common air. He found, in short, that, in all cases of combustion, the process was infinitely more rapid and perfect in this kind of air, than in the ordinary atmosphere; † and he was thence induced to apply the term *dephlogisticated* to the gas he had thus obtained.

* *Experiments and Observations on Different Kinds of Air, &c.* II. 107. Birmingham, 1790.

† The following paragraph, with which Dr. Priestley prefaces his account of the discovery of dephlogisticated air, presents a picture of his mind in regard to the origin of his own researches:

"The contents of this section will furnish a very striking illustration of the truth of a remark which I have more than once made in my philosophical writings, and which can hardly be too often repeated, as it tends greatly to encourage philosophical investigations; viz. that more is owing to what we call *chance*, that is, philosophically speaking, to the observation of *events arising from unknown causes*, than to any proper design or preconceived *theory* in this business. This does not appear in the works of those who write *synthetically* upon these subjects, but would, I doubt not, appear very strikingly in those who

He regarded it as air deprived of phlogiston, and thus accounted for its eager attraction for that principle which, during combustion, bodies were imagined to throw off. On the contrary, he accounted for the extinction of flame by the air discovered by Rutherford, and since termed azote* or nitrogen, † upon the idea that that aeriform fluid was charged or saturated with phlogiston, and he, therefore, called it phlogisticated air.‡

In enumerating the higher merits of Dr. Priestley as a discoverer, we must not forget the minor advantages which his ingenuity bestowed upon experimental chemistry. He supplied the Laboratory with many new and useful articles of apparatus, and the improved methods of managing, collecting and examining gaseous fluids, were chiefly the results of his experience. He was the first who, with any chance of accuracy, endeavoured to ascertain the relative or specific gravities of the different kinds of air then known; he observed that dephlogisticated air was rather heavier, and phlogisticated air somewhat lighter, than that of the atmosphere; nitrous air he conceived to be nearly of the same specific gravity. His experiments were made by the help of a delicate balance and exhausted flask.

The influence upon the respiration of animals of a species of air marked by the eminent perfection with which it supports combustion, did not escape Dr. Priestley's notice. On applying to it his test of nitrous air, he found the absorption produced on mixture greater than with atmospheric air; whence he conjectured its superior fitness for the support of life; he introduced mice into it, and found that

are the most celebrated for their philosophical acumen, did they write *analytically* and *ingenuously*." (*Exp. and Obs.* II. 103.)

* From α and $\zeta\alpha\eta$, "destructive of life."

† i. e. Producer of nitric acid.

‡ The application of dephlogisticated air to obtain intense degrees of heat, and its probable uses in medicine, were subjects which did not altogether escape Dr. Priestley's attention, and he has alluded to them in the section of the work already quoted, relating to its "Properties and Uses."

they lived longer than in an equal bulk of atmospheric air; he then had the curiosity to taste the gas himself, and after two or three respirations, he felt, or fancied he felt, a peculiar sensation of lightness and ease of the chest. "Who can tell," says he, "but that in time this pure air may become a fashionable article in luxury? Hitherto only two mice and myself have had the privilege of breathing it." To this he foolishly adds, that "the air which nature has provided for us is as good as we deserve."

We have not yet exhausted Dr. Priestley's discoveries, but have seen enough to establish his claims to the title of a great benefactor to chemical science. If we compare him with his predecessor Black, he falls short in depth of judgment, but in quickness of conception, and industry of pursuit, he excels even such a standard of comparison. The one climbed the hill of discovery with slow and cautious steps, and calmly enjoyed the surrounding views; the other made a more rapid ascent, but was giddy when he reached the summit; hence those distortions and misconceptions, those erroneous notions and hasty conclusions which he who turns over the philosophical writings of Dr. Priestley cannot fail to discern.

Upon the other productions of his pen, metaphysical, political and moral, it is neither my province nor inclination to dwell; they abound in the defects, but are deficient in the merits, of his tracts upon chemical subjects.

From the commencement to the termination of his busy career, Dr. Priestley was a staunch supporter of the unintelligible system of phlogiston: he adopted it in all its original incoherence and absurdity; and the last of his scientific publications was a tract in its defence, in which are adduced a variety of objections to the revived hypotheses of Rey and Mayow and Hooke, which having long lain dormant, were at this time erupted into the chemical world under the specious title of the French theory.*

It will not be denied that the leading facts just detailed threw considerable light upon the nature and properties of atmospheric air; but those who have entitled Dr. Priestley the discoverer of its composition, have somewhat overstepped the bounds of correctness.

He seems, indeed, to have possessed no just notions of the difference between phlogisticated and dephlogisticated air; and, instead of regarding them as distinct chemical principles, adopted the notion of one elementary substance, charged, in the one instance, with the imaginary essence of inflammability, and free from it in the other. In these inquiries, he frequently verges upon more correct and refined views, but has no sooner entered the right path, than phlogiston, like an *ignis fatuus*, dances before

Water refuted. It contains a variety of miscellaneous observations on the phlogistic and antiphlogistic theories, but it would be useless to follow the author into his unsubstantial speculations on these subjects. He has, however, thrown out some important considerations relating to his claims of originality as the discoverer of dephlogisticated air. The following paragraph appears of sufficient importance to be transcribed. "Now that I am on the subject of the *right to discoveries*, I will, as the Spaniards say, leave no ink of this kind in my inkhorn; hoping it will be the last time that I shall have any occasion to trouble the public about it. M. Lavoisier says (*Elements of Chemistry, English translation*, p. 36), 'this species of air (meaning dephlogisticated) was discovered almost at the same time by Mr. Priestley, Mr. Scheele and myself.' The case was this:—Having made the discovery some time before I was in Paris in 1774, I mentioned it at the table of M. Lavoisier, when most of the philosophical people in the city were present; saying, that it was a kind of air in which a candle burned much better than in common air, but I had not then given it any name. At this all the company, and M. and Madame Lavoisier as much as any, expressed great surprise; I told them I had gotten it from *precipitate per se*, and also from *red lead*. Speaking French very imperfectly, and being little acquainted with the terms of Chemistry, I said *plomb rouge*, which was not understood, till M. Macquer said, I must mean *minium*. Mr. Scheele's discovery was certainly independent of mine, though I believe not made quite so early." P. 88.

* The tract alluded to in the text was published by Dr. Priestley after his retirement to America in 1800. It is entitled, *The Doctrine of Phlogiston established, and that of the Composition of*

his eyes, and leads him into the marshy mazes of error.

In the preceding investigations, Dr. Priestley followed those methods of collecting æriform fluids over water, which Hales and others had employed before him: he now ascertained that there were some gases absorbed by or soluble in water. Mr. Cavendish, one of the most eminent philosophers of that day, had announced this circumstance, and was puzzled by it; but Dr. Priestley, with his usual and dexterous ingenuity, overcame the difficulty, by employing quicksilver instead of water, over which fluid metal he preserved and examined several kinds of air, which are instantly deprived of their elastic state by the contact of water.

The first permanently elastic fluid of this description which he examined, was the muriatic acid; he obtained it by heating copper in the fluid acid, or common spirit of salt, and called it marine acid air.

He immediately ascertained its absorption by water, and its powerful acidity; he found it incapable of supporting flame, and extremely destructive of animal life. He examined the action of a variety of substances upon this gas, and ascertained the remarkable rapidity with which it is absorbed by charcoal, and several vegetable and animal substances. Some unsuccessful attempts were made to ascertain the specific gravity of this gas, from which Dr. Priestley correctly concluded, however, that it was a little heavier than air.

The success attending these experiments, and the readiness with which he procured and retained the gaseous muriatic acid, led him to extend his trials to other acids, when he found, that, by acting upon vitriolic acid by inflammable substances, he could procure from it a permanently elastic fluid, to which he gave the name of vitriolic acid air; he found that, like the marine acid air, it was rapidly absorbed by water, and must be collected and preserved over quicksilver; that it was nearly twice as heavy as atmospheric air; that it extinguished flame, and was instantly fatal to animal life; that it reddened vegetable blues, and destroyed most colours. This air is, in fact, produced by burning sulphur in the atmosphere, and straw,

wool, and other materials, are frequently bleached by exposing them to its fumes.*

Having thus obtained permanent æriform fluids, having acid qualities, it occurred to Dr. Priestley, that the volatile alkali, the substance which gives pungency to salvolatile, spirit of hartshorn, and similar compounds,

* Having elsewhere praised Dr. Priestley's candour, I insert the following extract from his history of the discovery of *Vitriolic Acid Air*, to shew the exactness with which he acknowledges the hints and assistance of others:

"My first scheme was to endeavour to get the vitriolic acid in the form of air, thinking that it would, probably, be easy to confine it by quicksilver, for, as to the nitrous acid, its affinity with quicksilver is so great that I despaired of being able to confine it to any purpose. I, therefore, wrote to my friend Mr. Lane, to procure me a quantity of volatile vitriolic acid," &c. "Seeing Mr. Lane the winter following, he told me, that if I would only heat any oily or greasy matter with oil of vitriol, I should certainly make it the very thing I wanted, viz. the volatile or sulphureous vitriolic acid; and, accordingly, I meant to have proceeded upon this hint, but was prevented from pursuing it by a variety of engagements.

"Some time after this I was in company with Lord Shelburne, at the seat of Mons. Trudaine, at Montigny, in France; where, with that generous and liberal spirit by which that nobleman is distinguished, he has a complete apparatus of philosophical instruments, with every other convenience and assistance for pursuing such philosophical inquiries as any of his numerous guests shall choose to entertain themselves with. In this agreeable retreat I met with that eminent philosopher and chemist, Mons. Montigni, Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences; and conversing with him upon this subject, he proposed our trying to convert oil of vitriol into vapour, by boiling it on a pan of charcoal in a cracked phial. This scheme not answering our purpose, he next proposed heating it together with oil of turpentine. Accordingly, we went to work upon it, and soon produced some kind of air confined with quicksilver; but our recipient being overturned by the suddenness of the production of the air, we were not able to catch any more than the first produce, which was little else than the common air which had lodged on the surface of the liquor, and which appeared to be a little phlogisticated by its not being much affected by a mixture of nitrous air."

might be also procured in a pure and isolated gaseous form; and, after several unsuccessful trials, he succeeded, by heating a mixture of quicklime and sal ammoniac, when a great quantity of air escaped, permanent over quicksilver, but, like the acid gases, rapidly absorbed by water.

The odour of this gas was pungent in the extreme, and it possessed the property of salvolatile, smelling salts, and similar substances, of turning vegetable blues to green. After several experiments, in which the absorbing powers of different substances in regard to this air, were tried, Dr. Priestley became impatient to discover the effect of mixing it with the acid airs just described,—he imagined that he should form a neutral air. On putting this notion, however, to the proof of experiment, he was surprised to observe, that when marine acid air, and the volatile alkaline air, were mixed in due proportions, they were wholly condensed into a solid. And with sulphureous air a very similar result was afforded.

Dr. Priestley concluded that alkaline air was considerably lighter than acid air, because, on mixing them over mercury, he observed the former to float above the latter; on putting a lighted candle into alkaline air the flame was enlarged, and a portion of the air appeared to burn with flame.

We have now considered the principal discoveries of Dr. Priestley, upon which his title to originality rests, and it must be allowed that they are not less important than numerous. If we even consider them merely as insulated facts, they are of a very superior character, and tended greatly to enlarge our knowledge of the chemical elements of matter; but the new views of many natural and artificial phenomena, which they exposed, and which before were buried in deep obscurity, confer upon them a more exalted aspect, and have obtained for them the deserved meed of universal admiration. In perusing Dr. Priestley's tracts, we find the thread of the narrative occasionally knotted with conceit, and weakened by garrulity; but these blemishes are compensated by prevailing candour and perspicuity of style: he had greatly extended the boundaries of science, and was awake to the impor-

tance of his conquests; but resisted that febrile thirst of innovation and reform, which was endemic among contemporary chemists.

"At present," says he, in the Preface to his third volume of *Experiments and Observations*, relating to various branches of Natural Philosophy, "At present all our *systems* are in a remarkable manner unhinged by the discovery of a multiplicity of *facts*, to which it appears difficult or impossible to adjust them: we need not, however, give ourselves much concern on this account. For, when a sufficient number of new facts shall be discovered, towards which even imperfect hypotheses will contribute, a more general theory will soon present itself, and, perhaps, to the most incurious and least sagacious eye. Thus, when able navigators have, with great labour and judgment, steered towards an undiscovered country, a common sailor, placed at the mast head, may happen to get the first sight of land. Let us not, however, contend about merit, but let us all be intent on forwarding the common enterprise, and equally enjoy any progress we may make towards succeeding in it, and, above all, let us acknowledge the guidance of that great Being, who has put a spirit in man, and whose inspiration giveth him understanding." With this quotation, sufficiently characteristic of his general style, I shall take leave of Dr. Priestley, and introduce another hero of chemical history, his contemporary and great rival, Scheele.

Dudley,

November 5, 1818.

SIR,

IT affords me great pleasure to be able fully to vindicate the character of Dr. Bentley, from the very severe charge brought against him by Mr. Rutt, in the last number of the *Monthly Repository* [pp. 624, 625]. I have before me, bound up with several tracts on the same subject, by Bentley, Swift, Addenbrooke, Whiston, and others, a copy of Collins's "*Discourse of Free-thinking*," in 8vo. The first leaf is unhappily lost, and there are no means of ascertaining the date of the impression. At the 90th page, a passage of Victor is quoted from Mill's *Prolegomena*, and it is thus translated by Collins: "*In the consulship of*

Messalla, at the command of the emperor Anastasius, the holy Gospels, as written by Idiot Evangelists, are corrected and amended." The translation is printed in italics, and the original Latin is given, as a note, at the foot of the page.

In the *Biographia Britannica*, article *Collins*, Dr. Kippis tells us, that "the Discourse of Free-thinking was reprinted at the Hague, with some additions and corrections, in 1713, in 12mo., though in the title-page it is said to be printed at London. In this edition, the translations in several places are corrected from Dr. Bentley's *Remarks*, and some references are made to those *Remarks*, and to Dr. Hare's *Clergyman's Thanks*." I have no doubt that Mr. Rutt's copy of *Collins* is the corrected Hague edition, to which Dr. Kippis refers. Both *Collins's* "Discourse," and Bentley's "Remarks," passed through at least two editions in the year 1713.

A competent judge, Dr. Thomas Edwards, speaking of this controversy, observes, perhaps with too much severity, "I look upon these *Remarks on Free-thinking*, to be one of the most capital and masterly performances that have ever appeared in English; and I am at a loss which to admire most, the stupidity, ignorance and blunders of *Collins*, or the wit, erudition and accuracy of *Bentley*." *

I cannot, Sir, avoid expressing my concern, that the literary correctness, and, above all, the moral integrity, of so distinguished a man as Dr. Bentley, should be impeached, without the most positive and satisfactory evidence. I am sure, my excellent friend Mr. Rutt, will deeply regret that his abhorrence of what is disingenuous and unfair in controversy, should have betrayed him into such an act of injustice towards the illustrious dead.

J. H. BRANSBY.

November 7, 1818.

P. S. Since writing the above, I have found in *Nichols's "Literary Anecdotes,"* Vol. II. pp. 673—678, a correspondence between Dr. Lort, of Cambridge, and Mr. Prichard, a Herefordshire gentleman, on the passage in question. Dr. Lort had a copy of *Collins's* "Discourse," of the same

* Edwards's "Two Dissertations," 1766, p. 24, Note.

edition with mine, in which "the passage is actually translated." I apprehend this pamphlet to be of considerable rarity, and, as it involves Dr. Bentley's reputation, of no trifling importance. Mr. Prichard, "a great free-thinker," characterizes Dr. Bentley's "Remarks," as the "most pedantically affected, awkwardly witty, overbearing and scurrilous" book that he ever read; and adds, that upon his mentioning "this *Idiotis Evangelistis* affair" to "a worthy dignitary of the church," he replied, that "*nothing was too impudent for Dr. Bentley.*" "That *Collins*," says Dr. Lort, "should profit from his adversary's *Remarks*, and alter such passages in his book as he was convinced thereby were wrong, is so far from deserving censure, that it rather merits commendation; but then an honest and impartial searcher after truth would candidly own his mistakes, or, at least, in the different editions of his book, would fairly tell his readers in the title-page, that it was the second, third, or fourth edition, revised and corrected; whereas the chicanery, for I cannot call it otherwise, made use of by him, to conceal those circumstances, savours much more of the Jesuit than of the generous and real Free-thinker."

It is a very curious and amusing fact, that in the edition which I possess of *Collins's* "Discourse," the philanthropic author thus concludes: "*I think it virtue enough to endeavour to do good, only within the bounds of doing yourself no harm.*" In the Hague edition, after the words *virtue enough*, is inserted this most liberal, qualifying parenthesis: "*In a country so ignorant, stupid, superstitious, and destitute of all private and public virtue as ours.*" See *Biog. Brit.* II. 23.

Norwich,

SIR,

November 9, 1818.

IN common, no doubt, with most of your readers, my mind was greatly shocked and saddened by the mournful and bitter intelligence of the melancholy termination of the life of Sir Samuel Romilly. Under the impression which it made upon me, and from my love and admiration of his many and great virtues, I closed my sermon of last Sunday evening with the following brief but humble tribute of respect to his revered memory; which

if you are willing, I send for insertion in the next month's Repository.

I had been speaking of the need which man has of a revelation, and concluded thus:

"Inestimable is the value of our Christian faith, and happy is he whose mind reposes upon it with the most perfect trust;—happy he who, upon this subject, has the fewest doubts and misgivings. The longer we live, the more must we be convinced how much of the pleasantness and the beauty of this life would be taken away, if it were not regarded as the forerunner of another and a better. In this world, few days pass over our heads without the occurrence of something alarming and appalling to our weak and shivering nature. When we see how soon the greatest minds are overturned; how speedily the brightest intellect and the purest virtue become eclipsed, or go down ere their day be spent; when we see constantly removed from before our eyes those who have been the light and life and ornament of our age, who walked in wisdom's ways, and trod the paths of justice; when we behold these things, and stand wondering at our own mysterious being, what a privilege and a happiness it is that, from such contemplations, we can take refuge in the thought of that country, nigh which despair comes not, and where the voice of lamentation and weeping is heard no more. Our country, mankind, has this week been deprived of one of its best and ablest friends. He is gone upon whom the eyes of oppressed and weeping humanity have been long fixed as its firmest stay and trust. He is gone whom Mercy and Benevolence were eager to acknowledge as their constant and faithful servant. He is gone whom all good men delighted to honour as the advocate of justice, and the defender of him that had none to help him. 'The eye that hath seen him shall see him no more.' We may seek him, but shall not find him.—

'Bitter constraint and sad occasion dear!'

"Mournful, indeed, it is, that such a life, at such a time, should have been lost to his country—to the world: more mournful still that its beautiful day should have been closed by so dark an hour; but over this last and

dreadful act let us draw, as no doubt the mercy of God will draw, the veil of oblivion. In the deep darkness of his soul it was done, and let it not be remembered against him. The bright deeds of his life who can forget? His labours of love who will cease to remember? The tear shed upon his grave will be a tribute to virtue—an offering and a sacrifice to the spirit of humanity. He rests from his toils, but his works shall follow him. The name of Romilly, embalmed in the regrets, consecrated in the love and admiration of living minds, will go down to distant ages with a blessing on it. When *we* are numbered with the dead, and the remembrance of our names has perished from the earth, he will live in the thoughts and be cherished in the recollection of thousands. Generation after generation shall rise up and speak of his good deeds, and teach their children to lisp the story of his virtues. The remembrance of his name shall dwell in the bosoms of the just, and warm their hearts to mercy. Thus the virtuous and the good never die: they continue to live even upon earth, by the thoughts which they inspire, and the actions to which they prompt. And in heaven their spirits are with God. In his keeping they are sure and safe. Let us gladden and fortify our hearts with this faith. When the sun of our human hopes is set, and the light of present comforts is withdrawn, let us think of that day which no darkness shall overshadow, when God shall be unto us an everlasting light, and his favour our eternal glory."

THOMAS MADGE.

Bere-Regis, Dorset,

October 3, 1818.

SIR,

AS your valuable miscellaneous publication admits literary as well as theological subjects, should the following appear worthy attention, it is much at your service.

An old book* is lately come into my possession, on the top of whose

* The title of the book is, "Miscellaneous Translations, in Prose and Verse, from Roman Poets, Orators and Historians." 12mo. It is dedicated, *in Latin*, to "the Rev. Doctor Robert Sutton."

Signed, "W. Warburton."

Date of publishing, "C1710CCXXIII."

title-page is written, "R. Disney, 1753."

The sole reason of my noticing it to yourself, Sir, is on account of a MS. narrative, written on an otherwise blank leaf prefixed to the title-page, of which MS. the following is a *literal copy* :—

"The author of this book was once a practising attorney at Newark-upon-Trent, Nottinghamshire.

"The place of *town-clerk* becoming vacant, this truly great man, and my cousin *Richard Twells*, (a man of no despicable parts, and well-learned too,) were competitors for this little employment (for it is not, *communibus annis*, worth above 40*l.* per annum). *Twells* having the better interest in that mean corporation, (for *Mr. Cooke*, who had been *twice mayor*, *made shoes* for all our family, and used to bring them home himself,) had a majority in that despicable body, and obtained the place. *Warburton* was so piqued at the disappointment, that he fell hard to his studies, got into orders, and having good friends, is now one of the greatest divines we have, *quond* critical erudition.

R. D."

I have given you a copy *verbatim*, and I believe *literatim*, for I have copied his abbreviations and parentheses.

Thinking that almost any information, which is *authentic*, relative to such a man as *Warburton*, is too valuable to be lost, and supposing that the "*R. Disney*" referred to, may have been a *paternal ancestor* of the late worthy *Dr. Disney*,* are my reasons for troubling you with this communication.

JOSEPH LAMB.

Swansea,

October 10, 1818.

SIR,

I HAIL the establishment of various Fellowship Funds as the dawn of more successful times for Unitarianism, little else being now required to enable it to keep pace with the present rapid march of knowledge and improvement, than a general fund for the removing of certain impediments which retard its progress, and diminish its respec-

tability. All that could be accomplished by talents, industry, example, and by controversy, has been nobly performed by the champions of the cause: they have planted, it is ours to water, that the fruit may be more speedily brought to maturity. The Fellowship Funds certainly appear well calculated to effect this desirable object.

Warmed with this persuasion, I may perhaps be hurried by impatience, since I cannot suppress a feeling of great disappointment at finding, that in the course of two years, not more than twenty Fellowship Funds have been announced, whereas, a very imperfect and scanty list of Unitarian societies reaches to one hundred and fifty.

Either I must delude myself with a prospect of imaginary benefits to result from these funds, or their utility has not been duly considered by many societies; for nothing but the absence of the strong conviction which I feel of their high importance, can account for tardiness or indifference as to a measure which appears so simple in its detail, so powerful in its operation, and so completely within the reach of the most circumscribed means.

I may assert with confidence that there is not an Unitarian in the kingdom, who does not either personally suffer from, or see abundant cause to lament the non-existence of that which it is so entirely in their power to create, and still we go on year after year, in a state of suffering and inactivity, permitting the cause to languish under the chilling influence of poverty, societies in some cases without ministers, in others without proper places of worship; or if these be at length obtained, exposed to the certainty of a heavy debt, inextinguishable by any other means than private charity.

I must own, that looking to the zeal, the resolution and perseverance, required to produce an Unitarian, and at the same time to the simple measure which has now been for two years submitted to consideration, I feel at a loss to account for the existence of the above evils and deficiencies, being quite unwilling to suppose that the moment of conversion, the act of profession, or the comfortable establishment of any individual society, is the signal for returning apathy, or of indifference

* Of whose upright and truly honorable life and happy death, an interesting sketch was given in a recent number of your work [XII. 257—261].

towards the general interests of the cause; but what name, then, shall we give it, since the Unitarian church remains in debt, and deficient of ministers, when its members have the means, with great ease to themselves, of providing for both, and it is not done;—when a body of 50,000 Dissenters (and they have been estimated much higher) possess no other fund for general purposes than the diminutive sum of 400*l.* per annum, chiefly arising from legacies; and that, with an indolent sort of benevolence, they only give when distress grows clamorous, and then the aid being partial and ineffectual, disheartens both the giver and the receiver?

Disposed, however, to believe that it is not want of zeal, much less of liberality, but solely of conviction, which retards the application of the remedy, I beg to solicit the attention of Unitarians to the following considerations:—

The half of 50,000 penny-a-week subscriptions, would amount to upwards of 5000*l.* per annum; but the half of that sum would render the Unitarian cause flourishing as to its finances, compared with what it is. In a twelvemonth, scarcely a debt would remain upon any society; new chapels might be erected; whilst a sum would by degrees accumulate, for the purpose of educating and paying of missionaries, increasing the salaries of ministers; and societies would no longer feel disheartened, nor contribute by their debts and poverty, to deter men of unprejudiced minds from joining them, which, I have not a doubt, has happened; for, to change to an unpopular religion, and be taxed for it too, cannot but create an hesitation, highly favourable to the cause of orthodoxy. If this calculation be deemed too sanguine, let it be remembered that it supposes but 12,000 subscribers; if deemed admissible, let it prevail upon some of the able Correspondents in the Monthly Repository and Christian Reformer, to bring the subject frequently into notice and discussion, which, I trust, will not fail to recommend Fellowship Funds to general approbation and adoption.

DENARIUS.

SIR,
SOME of your readers are already aware that a Society has lately been formed in London, for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Dissenting Ministers belonging to the *Three Denominations*, (as they are called,) Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist. The importance of such a design to a highly deserving and very compassionate class of persons, and to our general interests as Dissenters, cannot, I think, be questioned; nor can any liberal mind be displeased to see different denominations of our brethren meeting on a common ground, and, without compromising their own individual opinions in regard either to doctrine or discipline, cordially agreeing to carry into effect a most benevolent object. But as the term Presbyterian has of late become somewhat ambiguous, and the reason of its adoption, as including Unitarians, may not, at first sight, be apparent to every one, I beg leave to say a very few words on that head. It has happened, that, for a series of years, Dissenters have been recognized by the government of the country as distributed into the three classes, Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist. And, in point of fact, it is certain, that Unitarian ministers, for instance, such distinguished individuals amongst them as Mr. Belsham and Mr. Aspland, belong to the General Body of Dissenting Ministers in London, *by ranking themselves* under the denomination, Presbyterian: consequently, that term cannot be understood to have any thing in its meaning that is exclusive.

If it be asked, why introduce "*Denominations*" at all into a charitable institution, I answer, that it is for the purpose of guarding against any misapplication of the funds to improper objects, whether through ignorance or partiality. Each denomination is supposed to be best acquainted with the claims of its own ministers, and, therefore, it is required that every minister applying for relief, shall be certified to be an approved minister by the class of Dissenters amongst whom he ranks himself. *They* are to be judges of his admissibility amongst their own body; and, if he be so certified, no questions can be asked respecting doctrinal opinions, ordination, or any other point of that kind.

This, I hope, will be considered as satisfactory. The principle is the same as that adopted in the Widows' Fund and the Society of Deputies, in both of which it is sufficiently notorious, that the claims of Unitarians are always considered equally with others. The Committee of the new Institution consists in part of Unitarians, which is, I conceive, a sufficient pledge of the manner in which the Society means to carry into effect its professed design, namely, that of embracing all the Denominations of Dissenters in the arms of Christian benevolence.

I sincerely wish that no misapprehensions or unfounded jealousies, on any side, may throw a damp upon a design likely to be so useful.

A CONSTANT READER.

Prescot,

October 8, 1818.

SIR,

YOU are often congratulated upon the gratifying success of the Unitarian cause, and its manifest extension in the United Kingdom; and you have had latterly the reiterated pleasure of reporting intelligence of the erection of new chapels.—Will you pardon me, if, like Jeremiah among the prophets of old, I rise up among my rejoicing brethren, to condole with you, Sir, and them, on the melancholy fact, that many of the chapels in which our ancestors worshiped, and in some of which our revered relatives have officiated, are either totally deserted, and in a state of alarming dilapidation, or have fallen into the hands of strangers!

I beg leave, Mr. Editor, to call your attention to three cases of the former nature, that I humbly conceive are deserving of notice; and which, I apprehend, might, by a little exertion and expense, be rescued from their present degraded and useless condition, and restored to their pristine dignity and usefulness: they are the Presbyterian chapels at Stafford, Stone and Newcastle-under-Line. It is a lamentable fact, that for some years, though commodious and endowed chapels, they have been either totally or partially disused, as religious edifices.

Respecting that at Newcastle-under-Line, I am not able to report so correctly and explicitly as I could wish to do. I have been informed, that

the interest there suffered materially by the conduct of the last incumbent; amiable and respected in his youthful days, and for some years revered by his people, but subsequently deserted by them, in consequence of his contracting very unpleasant habits. The major part of them, I understand, resolved upon uniting themselves to the episcopalian congregation of that town. A considerable endowment was enjoyed by Mr. —, up to the period of his death. It amounted, if I mistake not, to 60*l.* per annum. I am not prepared to say into whose hands it has fallen, nor whether it be recoverable: I rather think a trustee is living.

Of the Presbyterian chapels at Stafford and Stone, I can report more decidedly; as, during the last nineteen years of his life, my uncle, the late Rev. Henry Procter, was pastor of the small congregations that assembled in them. Small, indeed, were the congregations, when he assumed the pastoral charge; and as they were composed, principally at least, of aged persons, (some of them married, but without families, and others in a state of celibacy,) the melancholy office devolved upon him of interring the remains of friend after friend, in quick succession: and, by the rapid march that the infirmities of age made upon himself, he was prevented from making any great exertions to revive the cause. Since the death of my uncle, who departed this life in his 76th year, no stated minister has been appointed. During the consultations of the small remnant of his flock, in what manner they should act, I occasionally preached to them; but the most active trustee died, and the chapel has been since shut up. That at Stone, I have been recently informed, is occupied as a charity day-school, by the Independents of the town, who pay rent for the use of it. A venerable member of that little flock, died some months ago, and has left a son, with a numerous family. About two acres of land, and some money at interest, belong to that chapel.

The endowments, in land and money, attaching to the chapel at Stafford, amount, at a moderate calculation, to upwards of 30*l.* per annum. To this chapel there is a burial ground. One trustee, I rather think, survives, with

whose concurrence the emoluments might be regained and duly appropriated.

The above-mentioned towns are populous, particularly Stone and Newcastle-under Line, and conveniently situated for a junction of ministerial labours; the extreme distance from Stafford to Newcastle being only sixteen miles, and Stone is situated at nearly midway; or if the triple union should be found to be too laborious, for alternate services on a Lord's day, and weekly evening lectures, even the junction of Stafford and Stone might be worthy the consideration and patronage of the friends of Unitarianism. I have long considered this as a promising district for the exertions of an active young man of popular talents, amiable manners, and a proportionate zeal in the good cause.

I do not know whether it comports with the design and regulations of the Unitarian Fund, to patronize a speculation of this kind, under existing circumstances; though I am not without hope, that if the committee of that Fund are authorized to make the experiment, they would be gratified by success.

When travelling that way, frequently has the thought been painful to me, that there was not a brother minister after my own heart to be found between Congleton and Wolverhampton, a distance of at least forty-four miles, planted with populous towns and villages, in which, doubtless, some might be met with to whom the sound of Unitarian doctrines, simple but sublime, plain but consolatory, would be glad tidings indeed.

These hints, Mr. Editor, I have taken the liberty of suggesting for your consideration. If they meet with your approbation, and the experiment of reviving the sacred cause, under a purified form, be deemed advisable, I shall be happy to communicate any additional items of information that may be requested.

W. T. PROCTER.

On Mr. Belsham's Censure of Mr. Robinson.

(Continued from p. 571.)

SIR,

HAVING, in a former letter, alluded to the apostolical writers,

VOL. XIII.

4 T

in connexion with the apostolical fathers, I may be permitted, it is hoped, to draw them into a nearer connexion, by comparing them together, in a few particulars that have forced themselves on my notice; and that, before entering upon farther observations on Mr. Robinson's History.

Though the preceding letters do not profess to go into the subject of Baptism at large, and, indeed, more immediately relate to Mr. Robinson's History; yet, of necessity they have, at intervals, touched on points which concern the general question; some connected with the interpretation of various passages in the apostolical writings, others with certain notions on tradition and apostolical authority. I allude more particularly to the apostolical writings now, on a supposition, which is admitted, that they are nearly, if not of the same age, with those of the writings (with the exception of Tertullian's) just referred to; and by the absolute genuineness of any of them, the question is but little affected: for I am not ignorant that some learned, and, I doubt not, very honest men, will not admit even these to be narratives of genuine facts, nor to be written by those whose names they bear; yet, as the bulk of real Christians do, and those who are only nominally so, have made them the matter of their appeals and criticisms; as all these writings, as well those of the apostolical fathers as of the apostles, are allowedly very ancient, and written at periods not very distant from each other; it may be reasonably expected, that many things which admit of criticism and dispute, may, by such comparison, be much illustrated. For example: it may be inferred, that the commission to teach, *make disciples of*, or instruct, μαθητεῖν, (Matt. xxviii. 19,) relates solely to adults, and excludes infants, from the sense put on it in the apostolical fathers: thus, *the making disciples of*, or *instructing*, is analogous to Ignatius's expression, in which, speaking of himself, he adds, "I am now only beginning to be a disciple, μαθητευέσθαι (or to be instructed), and I exhort you as my fellow-disciples, συμαθητάς. *Epist. ad Ephes. c. 3.* So where he is speaking of unbelievers, he subjoins, "for with respect to them there is a hope that they may repent, and be

taught by your good works (μαθητευ-
θηνας). *Ibid.* c. 10. See also *Ep. ad*
Romanos, c. 3.

So again, as to Stephanas's house-
hold, if the circumstances of their
administration in the church, and
other particulars mentioned in the
apostolical writings, did not *limit* them
to adults, I should think the following
passages would explain the phrase:
as, where Ignatius, using a similar
phrase, yet meaning to include *child-*
ren, expressly mentions them: thus
in the Epistle to Polycarp, "I greet
the wife of Epitropus with her whole
household, and her children." And Ter-
tullian, where he is speaking only of
adults, introducing the case of Step-
hanas's household, asks, why did he (St.
Paul) baptize (tinxit) Gaius, Crispus,
and Stephanas's household? *

In such places, the words μαθητης
and μαθητευω, suppose such a condition
of persons as were made disciples by
instruction, or capable of being so, or
repenting and believing, &c., which,
of course, cannot include infants; and
this is the sense of them in all the
earliest Christian writers, and in all
the Greek classical authors. Indeed,
how can persons be disciples, who are
not taught, or capable of being taught?
And no such early writer ever dreamt
of making the word *teach*, *make dis-*
ciples (μαθητευσατε), synonymous with
βαπτίζετε, including infants incapable
of instruction. Indeed, very long after
the period here supposed, the first ca-
techetical lectures, as those of St.
Cyril, addressed to *catechumens* or *dis-*
ciples, are all addressed to persons capa-
ble of instruction. (I shall have occa-
sion to speak of Gregory of Nazianzen
in the proper place.) And this sense
of the word μαθητευω, is so obvious,
that even our most critical commen-
tators and expositors of the Church
of England,—Dr. Whitby, Bishop
Burnet, (in his Exposition on the
Thirty-nine Articles,) and Dr. Ham-
mond himself, (in his Paraphrase and
Annotations,) when he was, perhaps,
a little off his guard,—have admitted
it in its fullest, amplest sense. I beg
leave to add, that Mr. Walker, too,
Mr. Wall's predecessor in this contro-

versy, in a similar case, and no less
incautiously, makes this distinction,
where speaking on Mark i. 4, of John's
baptism in the wilderness, he adds,
that is, 1st, instruct the people; 2d,
who *were* to be baptized in the doc-
trine of repentance and remission of
sins. In short, if there is any truth
in the adage,

Αρχει υδωρ κρησερα, ο ανευ βιβλου μεν-
θανων,

He, who attempts to read without a book,
Into a sieve draws water from the brook,

we may of people discipling without
teaching, say,

Αντι των γονων βουτας τισις εροται,

Men now are taught, and in the parents'
place,

To look with rev'rence at the conj'ring
race.

Mr. Wall, in his History of Infant
Baptism, has lavished much Christian
ink in a most unfortunate critique on
this word, μαθητευω.

Again, the word βαπτίζω, with other
words synonymous with it in the New
Testament, does, in my humble opinion,
in regard to believers baptized, in-
variably relate to an entire covering of
the body, and to adults; and that is
the uniform meaning of the same
words in the same relation, in the
apostolical fathers, and Tertullian's
book, *De Baptismo*; I must add, too,
with leave of Mr. Walker and Mr.
Wall, of Justin Martyr. In going
over the different ancient writers'
sense of βαπτίζω,* the former quite
omits the Patres Apostolici, which was
prudent; for they certainly are di-
rectly and strongly against his expli-
cation of Justin Martyr, as, indeed,
Justin Martyr himself is, according to
the latter's own representations, as
could be most easily shewn; for the
exposition of the Magdeburgh Centu-
riators, (2d Collect. 110, L. 48,) though
condemned by Mr. Walker, is cou-
firmed by the whole tenor of Justin
Martyr's Apologies. Atq. ita (this is
their exposition) hoc lavacro mersati
lustrantur; that is, and so being im-
mersed in this laver, they are cleansed:
and if Mr. Walker's application of Ter-
tullian's *Rantization*, (Mr. W.'s own
word,) in his book, *De Penitentia*,

* The learned Van Dale has fully vin-
dicated this sense of the word *Baeith*, as
used in the Hebrew Scriptures.—*Dissert.*
de Pedobaptismo.

* Βαπτισμων Διδαχη, by Wm. Walker,
B. D. 1678. Ch. 3.

C. 2.) incidentally, and in a peculiar sense introduced, is not fully contradicted by Tertullian's most formal and complete account of Baptism in the above treatise, I have read it, I will confess, to very little purpose.

Once more: *Suffer little children to come unto me*, &c. Many Christian ladies would, no doubt, have been pleased, if Christ had baptized these children, and then have said to his disciples, "Go ye, and do likewise;" but no such thing, as we have already seen; and we have seen that no such custom was practised by the Catholic Church in the time of Tertullian.

Many other parallelisms between the writers of the New Testament and the other first Christian writers, might be thus easily brought together; but by the assistance of the passages introduced in the last letter, the reader may easily do this himself: and, I think, that gentlemen who are so fond of *primitive antiquity*, will allow, that this way of illustrating by synchronisms, or by the writings of men who were at least nearly contemporary, is a fair one. Of Irenæus and Origen, notice will be taken in the proper place.

In connexion with this way of considering the apostolical and other first Christian writers, a few ideas on the subject of tradition and apostolical authority present themselves. Mr. Wall says, "the apostolical writings are too obscure to found Infant Baptism upon." Indeed! Yet surely this obscurity, I must say, this total silence, on what we are told is a positive duty, enjoined on all Christian parents to the end of the world, this is surely somewhat extraordinary, and in the writers themselves must have been highly criminal. If the apostles had the doctrine, they had it, as will be readily supposed, in command from their Master: and if the apostolical writings are, as we now have them, authentic, and yet they do not expressly enjoin this practice; if they cannot afford to speak clearly and fully about it; if, notwithstanding they dealt out a most sacred command, over and above their own writings, to be handed down, locked up like a jewel in a casket; if all this can be supposed, how did they fulfil that injunction which we read of, to publish what they knew on the house-top? Then again, in reference to these apostolical fathers and Justin

Martyr, all so nearly contemporary with the apostles and Tertullian, if there had been any such tradition, they must have known it; they must have acted upon it, which, so far as appears from their writings, they did not, but contrary to it. Indeed, in proportion to the obscurity in which it was left in the apostles' writings, they ought to have been the more explicit. The poor ladies too, who were so anxious for Infant Baptism in the time of the ungallant Tertullian, ought to have said, How durst you enjoin us not to baptize our babes, when you know there is an apostolical tradition authorizing it?

These fair heretics were Christians, and had been settled long enough to have heard of this tradition and apostolical authority; they *must* have heard of it, had there been any ground for it; still more certainly must the Catholic Church. Deference to orthodoxy would lead many to this conclusion. With what face, then, could Tertullian, delivering at large the practice of that church with regard to Baptism, with all its concomitant ceremonies, and expressly mentioning *the law* for Baptism, which he does, —with what face could he have given such directions? This is not supposeable. We find nothing in Irenæus, notwithstanding the curious passage most unfortunately quoted by Mr. Wall on Infant Baptism, about this tradition; nothing in Cyprian, who comes next to Tertullian, and has written much on the *Rebaptization of Heretics*, and something on the *Baptism of Infants*, yet Cyprian says nothing of this tradition: perhaps Jerome may; certainly Augustine does; and then all sails free and easy under convoy of the civil magistrate: yet this brings us down to the end of the fourth or fifth century, and surely such testimony appearing then for the first time, comes too late to give credibility to the tradition. The assertion of these persons could only be the matter of their opinion at best; and their opinion is no ground for other people's faith: nay, for obvious reasons, the testimony of Jerome and St. Augustine is itself a strong presumption against the fact. Their cause certainly required some plea to hang upon; and tradition was the dead-lift to an argument which could find no other support.

But "wisdom is justified of her children." And while we are on this subject, it may not be disagreeable to some of your readers to hear the opinions of some eminent men relative to primitive custom. Our poet Milton was a man of universal literature, and of an upright, independent turn of mind; few were better acquainted with all matters of history and Christian antiquity, and his judgment concerning Baptism was, "that the practice here alluded to of baptizing adults by immersion, came nearest, to the primitive practice; but in the latter part of his life he was not a professed member of any particular sect among Christians; he frequented none of their assemblies, nor made use of their peculiar rites in his family." These are Toland's words, in his *Life of Milton*. Of the same opinion too was Mr. Whiston, who succeeded Sir Isaac Newton as Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge. His sentiment was so decided, that he at length regularly attended the ministry of the famous Dr. Foster, (who was of this persuasion,) of whom Pope writes,

Let modest Foster, if he will, excel
Ten metropolitans in preaching well.

Hear what Whiston says of himself, and of other eminent men of his time, on this subject.

"In the same year, 1712, I published a small pamphlet, entitled, '*Primitive Infant Baptism Revived*,' or, *An Account of the Doctrine and Practice of the two first Centuries concerning the Baptism of Infants*, in the words of the sacred and primitive writers themselves. Now, the occasion of my discovery of this ancient error of the baptizing of uncatechized infants, was a question put to me by Mr. Kelswell, when I was preparing to baptize him and a sister of his, who were very good Christians, except that they had never been baptized before, whether I should not think it better that Baptism should be used after instruction, than before. My answer was this; that I must honestly confess, that I should have thought so; but that I was no legislator, and so submitted to what I then thought a law of Christ. Whereupon I set myself to examine what the New Testament and the most early Fathers meant by the words which they used, when they speak of

Baptism of Infants, or little children; I mean *νηπια*, or *παιδια*, and which they esteemed not incapable of that holy ordinance; and I soon discovered, that they were only those capable of catechistic instruction, but not fit for understanding harder matters; and that none but such, in the first and second centuries, were ever made partakers of Baptism. This most important discovery I soon made known to the world in this paper, which Bishop Hoadly and Dr. Clarke greatly approved; but went on in their ordinary practice notwithstanding. I sent also this paper, by an intimate friend, Mr. Haines, to Sir Isaac Newton, and desired to know his opinion. The answer was this; that they had both discovered the same long before. Nay, I afterwards found that Sir Isaac Newton was so hearty for the Baptists, as well as for the Eusebians or Arians, that he sometimes suspected these two were the two witnesses in the Revelation."*

The learned Mr. Gilbert Wakefield had pursued the same course of inquiry into primitive antiquity, and arrived at the same conclusion, as may be seen in his new translation of St. Matthew's Gospel, and in his *Plain and Short Account of the Nature of Baptism*, in which he shews, "1st, that Scripture Baptism was performed by immersion; 2nd, that it was not performed on infants; 3rd, that it was not intended for the children of Christian parents." Which reminds me, that the most eminent of those learned men who have rejected water Baptism, were yet decided in the opinion, that the primitive mode was by immersion, and that uninstructed infants were not the subjects of it.†

This concise investigation presented to the reader in these letters, it will be perceived, has not been made in the way of zealous controversy, but of calm inquiry, in reference to primitive antiquity, and not with an entire ignorance of the probabilities and difficulties on each side of the question; and it was thought that it would not be disagreeable to some of your readers

* *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. William Whiston*. Written by himself. I. 204.

† See Socinus's *Treatise de Baptismo*; Mr. Robert Barclay's *Apology for the Quakers' Baptism*; and Mr. Emlyn's *Previous Question*.

to have the opinion of a few learned men, who have pursued the same inquiry in the same way, and of men, too, at least as honest as St. Augustine.

The writers above referred to, were unquestionably independent men, and at the time under no professional bias. But the evidence issuing from this source is so powerful, that it has impressed those whose professional creed inclined the other way. Dr. Isaac Barrow, Sir Isaac Newton's predecessor as Mathematical Professor at Cambridge, was eminent for his acquaintance with classical literature and Christian antiquities, as well as for his knowledge of the mathematics. He had made a similar research into this subject; and he speaks of it in a way so decidedly favourable to this side of the question, that the most rigid sectarian Baptist could not ask or even wish for more. He is accordingly quoted in testimony of it, by a respectable Baptist writer, Mr. Stennet, as Bishop Burnet is by the learned Dr. Gale. Bishop Taylor and Bishop Barlow have also, occasionally, expressed themselves in language very favourable to the same opinion; and I have myself received testimony as ample and full from learned clergymen in conversation: nor, indeed, can I perceive (except that I know learned men are sometimes less than the least of all men) how any one, who should take the same course of inquiring and comparing, can fairly and honestly avoid coming to the same conclusion.

And here let it be observed, to prevent the necessity of much criticism, (which the immediate object of these letters did not require,) that, if a fair statement has been given above of the primitive practice, the difficulties urged by several learned Pædobaptists, (in their views of certain passages in the New Testament,) it may be presumed, might be removed by considerations arising from the different manners, customs and climates of different nations: and should the word βαπτισμός, as applied to things, be used sometimes in a secondary sense, and be understood of a partial washing, as the learned Mr. Walker and Mr. Wall contend, still, as applied to persons, baptized according to the primitive mode, it appears to have been a total immersion, single or trine. So that should what those writers

contend for be granted, (though in their criticisms, in my humble opinion, there is not much,) still they would gain little but a gloss of words to their argument, without any substance of meaning. For even they do not deny that the primary signification of the words βαπτω and βαπτίζω, with respect both to things and persons, is to immerse; and, agreeably thereto, I think it will appear from what has been said, that the primitive mode of baptizing, as applied to persons, was always by immersion.

But—to be ingenuous and serious—though the ceremony of sprinkling new-born babes was comparatively of very late origin, Infant Baptism, properly so called, appears to have been of an early practice in the Christian Church. It was natural that it should be. The Orientals (as well as the Greeks and Romans) considered the ocean, as well as rivers and fountains, sacred; and bathing in them was made by them, as it is well known it continues by many to this day, a religious, daily rite. When the primitive Christians renounced the Pagan divinities, and among others those of the rivers, they did not abandon the sacredness of water: on the contrary, they improved upon it. Tertullian himself has shaped this idea into a most fanciful and extravagant form; and the peculiar sacredness of the baptismal water became a very popular notion. A mystical union of water and spirit, was supposed to take place; agreeably to those elegant lines, written by a later Latin poet, Paulinus:

Hic reparandarum generator fons animarum

Vivum divino lumine flumen agit:

Sanctus in hunc cælo descendit spiritus amicum,

Cælestiq: sacras fonte maritat aquas.

Tertullian, we have seen, considered it as making free of eternal life,* or as giving a right and title to it, and hence Corneille, in his admired tragedy of Polyeuctes, very correctly describes the sentiments of that period (the third century) to which his drama relates:

* Felix Sacramentum aquæ nostræ, qua abluti delictis pristinae cæcitatibus, in vitam æternam liberamur.—*De Bapt.*

Mais pour en recevoir la sacré caractère,
 Qui lave nos forfaits dans une eau salutaire,
 Et qui purgeant notre ame et desillant nos yeux,
 Nous rend le premier droit qui nous avions
 aux cieux.

Such, then, having been so early the popular belief, it was natural that Christian parents should wish to make their innocent children partakers of what made them so happy and secure; and that the fair sex would easily find advocates in behalf of their dear offspring, among bishops and elders of a more complaisant and complying character than the rigid Tertullian. For it was among the Africans that Infant Baptism is supposed to have originated, and even Africans, in this respect, were not different, probably, from all the world.

Mais vous ne savez pas ce que c'est qu'une femme,
 Vous ignorez quels droits elle a sur toute l'ame.

Add to this, that situated as the first Christians were among the Heathens, separating from them, and domesticating into churches, they would naturally wish to provide against their children's returning to Paganism; and by making them, together with themselves, members of their Christian family, to bring them within the pale of the church. And what more effectual preservative could there be than Baptism? And if, as is supposed, Infant Baptism originated in Africa, where the offering of infants in sacrifice, by fire, was practised to a most enormous degree, what preservative more benevolent? They had, too, before their eyes the example of religious separations and consecrations in the Gentiles and Jews, but especially among the latter, by religious ceremonies, particularly by water. The circumcision of the Jews, as the seal of a covenant with the offspring of God's people, would necessarily present itself; and the Africans were much of what is called Judaizing Christians. So that we may readily suppose, that Infant Baptism would be an easy, natural process; that it would be popular in practice, and be considered of a pious tendency.

If it appears, from what has been said, that Baptism by immersion was

the primitive mode, and the subjects of it adults; and if it is difficult, for the reasons advanced, to admit apostolical authority as the foundation of Infant Baptism, it is obvious that we must look for some other adequate cause, or combination of causes, (for in different churches there might arise different causes for the practice,) and those reasonable ones too. Whether any of the above be of that kind, is left to the judgment of the reader, nor do I feel any anxiety on the subject: for into causes, times and places, it is not my proper business, nor have I any inclination to inquire: for inquiring into causes is often like feeling about a dark place without a guide, and at every step we are liable to stumble. *Operum fastigia cernuntur, fundamenta latent.* Infant Baptism, it is probable, was a silent, gradual process, growing up among those who in general practised adult; it was administered, at first, it should seem, occasionally, in cases of necessity, or where there was a danger of death; it might be used at discretion or not; it might be left as matter of liberty, not made or considered as one of necessity, which was Grotius's opinion. It is not improbable, I think, that this restricted, occasional, conditional and free use of Infant Baptism, whenever it was first introduced, was practised pretty generally, and very early practised in the ancient Christian Churches; and growing, as it would, up in churches, where otherwise the immersing of adults was uniformly practised, it would be impossible, perhaps, to say when and where and under what circumstances it was first administered: but to call this occasional, accidental, conditional and free use of Infant Baptism, its universal practice would surely be an abuse of terms. For though it was probably a gradual process, yet even when it became more common, whatever the cause might be, it could only be, it must have been, partial. Universal it never could be. For, how could it be universal, when even at a much later period than that to which I allude, it is allowed on all hands, that great people were in the general habit of deferring baptism to a very late period, and those, the offspring of Christian parents? How could it be universal when we find the first cate-

chistical lectures, addressed to professing Christians, full of remonstrances and reasonings with people whose baptism had been delayed; when it appears, too, that in the school state of Alexandria, no less than in the church member-state of Jerusalem, the discipline was adapted only to persons teachable and taught? Mr. Robinson, after one or two observations on the vague sense of the word *salus*, (safety or salvation,) irrelevant there, and perhaps more ingenious than just, speaking of Austin's asserting "that the Baptism of Infants was a custom," very properly adds, "so far it might be right in some sense, as it referred to the backset-tlers; but when he affirmed it was derived from the apostles, he was wrong, for it was not a custom in any part of the world." There, at least, appears no evidence, from what we have already stated, that Infant Baptism is once alluded to for more than two hundred years after Christ, and that when first mentioned, as already has been shewn, it is opposed; and, under these circumstances, to talk of the universality of Infant Baptism, must surely be a very great misnomer.

But at all events, Infant Baptism was a seed of great promise; and when sown in a good soil, it would of necessity take deep root, and soon make an ample spread. The damning nature of Original Sin, (and St. Augustine's doctrine involved infants, and his work on Baptism turns entirely upon it,) which absolutely required the baptismal water to wash it away, would give great currency to the practice, and would render those who denied it odious and frightful; the establishing of it by law, both through the wide extent of the Greek and Roman Church, which soon took place; its suitableness to the purposes of despotical governments and religious houses, all over the Eastern and Western empire; these, with other corresponding, coetaneous causes, will readily account for the great extent of the practice; and from the time that the civil magistrate undertook its protection, it would neither be safe nor prudent (for it would have answered no good purpose) to oppose it, nor was it even practicable. Thus encouraged and authorized it would nestle, as it were, in the usages of the

dark ages, till eventually, like the insidious bird we read of, it dislodged the former occupants, and deposited its own productions in their room.

And, while speaking of infants and primitive antiquity, I am reminded of a remarkable charge, brought against the primitive Christians, of infanticide. This being made within the period just alluded to, it was repelled by the various apologists; and this surely was the time, had Infant Baptism been then practised, for them to have replied, "No! we do not kill our children, though we baptize them in water, and we know how to perform that without the least injury." On the contrary, one of them uses this language—"we charge *you* with killing them with cold, with starvation, by wild beasts, and with drowning them by a slower death in water. We, (men,) you say, sacrifice and initiate by killing infants." *Ad Nationes*, Lib. i. Some of these words, (they are Tertullian's,) I know, are forced into the question about Infant Baptism. But, in my humble opinion, they have nothing to do with it.

Farther: Could the existence of apostolical authority for Infant Baptism be proved, this would be but one part of a long argument; the other, and no less difficult, would remain to prove its obligation, for in matters of ceremony, we read that the apostles were liable to be mistaken. But a proof, most decisive I think, will be found in Justin Martyr, that no such practice was known in his time, and that no such authority existed. In his Apology addressed to the Roman Emperor, written in behalf of the Christians,* he gives a most minute account of their baptism, its prerequisites, its mode, its subjects, with every circumstance attending its performance, and consequent upon it: he professes to adulterate, to keep back nothing, yet he says nothing of infants and tradition; every thing relates to persons first instructed, and voluntarily taking up a profession, in contradiction to the first birth by gene-

* Apol. pro Christ. I. 5, Sect. 79, &c. Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur. I. 4. *De Bapt. contra Donatistas*. Cap. xxiii. xxiv.

ration, which, as he says, was of necessity. Now, here is not a single word about Infant Baptism. I know your Correspondent has quoted one or two Greek words from Justin, which he forms into an argument for Infant Baptism. But I speak with confidence, not a single allusion is made to it here, nor in any part of Justin's writings.

I think it has been observed before, that St. Cyprian, though an advocate for Infant Baptism, and even for what he calls, generally, *apostolical tradition*, where he thought he could found on it an argument for his domineering church government, yet says nothing of such tradition as a peculiar reference to Infant Baptism;* and what St. Cyprian, with his assessors in council, did say or think appears to me of very little consequence. But it was left, it should seem, to St. Augustine to deliver the entire doctrine upon this subject. He says, "What the church universal holds, what was not instituted by councils, but has always been retained, is most rightly believed to have been handed down only by apostolical authority."

Now, as I think the only reason why St. Cyprian did not make the same use of the sword of the civil magistrate, to enforce his dogmas, as Augustine did, was, because it was not at his command, I pay very little deference to his authority; yet I shall borrow the following passage from him, by way of illustration, though not in proof of any thing. It is, too, one of the few flowing passages in this Saint. He observes, "There is a compendious way for religious and simple minds, both to lay aside error, and to find and dig out the truth. For if we go to the head and origin of divine tradition, human error is at an end: and, the reason of the celestial sacraments being understood, whatever before lay obscured in mists, and a cloud of darkness, opens into the light of truth. If a channel bearing water, which once flowed copiously and largely, suddenly fails; do we not proceed to the fountain, that the reason of the failure may be there discovered, whether the veins being grown arid, the water at the spring-

head is dried up; or, whether after flowing from it pure and full, it has stopped in the midst of its course; that if it has been affected by the fault of the interrupted or bibulous channel, that the water has not flowed on perseveringly and largely, the bed of the stream being repaired and strengthened for the use and drink of the city, the water collected may be restored to the same copiousness and purity, with which it flowed from the fountain;* which the priests of God, who now preserve the divine precepts ought to do, that if in any thing the truth should waver and stumble, we should return to our Lord's and evangelical origin, and to apostolical tradition,† that there the rule of our action may arise, where the order and origin first arose?"

It is scarcely necessary, it may be hoped, to say, that this quotation is not made for the sake of the allusion to water.

It is worth remarking, however, that whatever blessings were to be derived from this apostolical tradition, is entirely reserved for Cyprian's *one church*, from which unity, whoever departed, he was of necessity to be found with heretics. "The sacrament of which unity (these are St. Cyprian's words) we see also expressed in the *Song of Songs*, from the person of Christ, saying, (and, by the bye, this may be taken as a fair specimen of St. Cyprian's, St. Augustine's and other such men's spiritualisms and criticisms,) 'A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse, a sealed fountain, a well of living water, a paradise with the fruit of apples.'" *Solomon's Song*, iv. 12. Within this garden, Cyprian's church, all these treasures were to be deposited: this is all very clear. But it is not so very clear, whether this apostolical tradition is referrible to any thing written in a book, which common sense could understand as well as St. Cyprian, or to something secreted like cucumbers in a garden, known only to Cyprian and his orthodox church: if it be taken in the

* Cæciliani Cypriani, Epist. lxxiv.

† Ad Originem Dominicam et Evangelicam, et Apostolicam Traditionem reverentur: et inde surgat actus nostri ratio, unde et ordo et origo surrexit. *Cypriani Epist. ut supra.*

* Cypriani Epistola lxxiv. Fido Fratri.

former sense, it might be used for some purpose of criticism on the subject alluded to; if in the latter, it must be left for the use of St. Cyprian and his little garden.

A little garden little Prowett made,
And fenc'd it with a little palisade;
And would you know the taste of little
Prowett,
This little garden will a little shew it.

D.

SIR, *Swakeleys, Nov. 5, 1818.*

YOUR Correspondent from Chester, [p. 619,] indirectly asks me a question, which I feel very ready to answer. A *Scriptural School* then, is, according to my notions, a school in which the Bible is the only religious book: in other words, an honestly and strictly *Protestant school*. What the creed of any founder of one may be, is, to my mind, a matter ineffably unimportant to every human being but himself. In those with which I have to do, the scholar is directed to the purest sources of belief, the teaching *totidem verbis* of the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles: and not to the purest only, but, as far as my experience goes, the plainest also. Let his capacity be what it may, a disciple at their feet alone will probably find difficulties in their discourses and narrative: on some points he may doubt, on many he will possibly err, and at one time or another differ from himself on all: but "to whom can he go" better than to them, to them alone? Let him resign his individual judgment, and travel with the host of commentators, over or out of the record, how will the matter be altered, even in this point of view in his favour? As his lot happens to fall, he may be sophisticated into a belief in Transubstantiation, in the Trinity, or in any other orthodox or heterodox dogma: but what has he gained, in point of authority, or mental assurance? He has left the church of Christ to become a member of that of Rome, of Constantinople, of England, of Scotland, of Otaheite. Are his embarrassments now all dissipated, have his doubts vanished, and infallibility or never-out-ism, become his happier portion? Or if they have, what is he the better for the exchange, but in the substitution of a wrong-headedness only made irreclaimable

VOL. XIII.

4 U

by further inquiry? While others, therefore, as conscientiously as myself, are anxious to make their plebeian pupils and protégés "*Presbyterian Unitarians*," or *Episcopalian Athanasians*, or any other *arians* or *asians*, I confess and profess myself content to refer mine altogether to the Logos and his contemporary missionaries, "without note or comment," solely as they are under my exclusive superintendence: and when that ceases, as I consider it to do, on every Saturday evening, their parents are at liberty to dispose of them as they please; when, in the school particularly alluded to, the little catechumens are free to learn a more popular theology at the present day, from an excellent Calvinistic minister of our bifform sect established by law, or some most praise-worthy young women in the village, of perhaps the same denomination, to whose kind assiduity during the week they are indebted, infinitely more than to my mere patronage, for what little advantage they may derive from education on this side the grave, or the inestimable benefit they may anticipate from it, on the other.

N. B. The scriptural inscription alluded to, is quoted alike by Christians of *all* denominations, and can, therefore, scarcely be assumed as a presumption of its having originated with any particular one. Well for "the Church," were it once again as invariably adhered to by it, in its creeds and forms of worship!

J. T. CLARKE.

SIR, *Nov. 9, 1818.*

THOUGH your Correspondent F. [p. 619] does not wish "to embroil himself" with the discussion respecting "*The Manchester Presbyterians*," he seems to have gone a little out of the way, on his visit to "*The School for Scriptural Christians*," in his remarks on the subject.

In that school he might have learnt the maxim, "*Judge not that ye be not judged*," before he so readily adopted the charge of "*duplicity*," against those *Manchester Presbyterians*. Were he actually presiding in the court of equity, to which he alludes, he probably would hear of, what Blackstone terms, "the right of taking by representation." And though little

more than the name of *Presbyterian* now adheres to their present representatives, a *wise and impartial* judge would construe *liberally* the case before him, and not hasten so readily to the "decision," which your Correspondent F. confesses himself inclined to make.

EUBULUS.

SIR,
THE publishers of the edition which has just appeared of Griesbach's New Testament, have been aware of the unsettled state in which, as your Correspondent Obscurus [p. 331] remarks, the note on Acts xx. 28, had been left in the former English edition of 1809, and have, in this as well as in other instances, introduced a better system of arrangement. There seemed to be little or no doubt from Griesbach and Birch's Notes, as well as from other sources, that *Θεσ* was the reading of the Vatican MS.; but they have set the matter at rest as far as they could, by procuring a fac-simile of the verse from Sig. Girolamo Amati, one of the Librarians, which is given in the Preface of the new edition. By this the reading appears finally decided to be *Θεσ*, at least as far as the certificate of the Librarian goes. It corresponds too with the report of *Obscurus*, who probably derived his information from a similar source; but it would certainly be well if *Obscurus* or any other person would communicate the result of a careful and accurate examination of the MS. in this place, although this may not easily be obtained. It is well known to have been in many places retouched: the general opinion is, that this has been done, (as the Editors of the New Version observe,) by a faithful hand; but it ought to be added, that some great names have doubted much the value of this MS. and it certainly is very singular, that it should differ from the Alexandrine (which it usually follows) on so important a point as this, and that too without being followed in its reading by MSS. and Versions generally considered as of the same school or class, and to which, if genuine, it would of course be expected to give the tone.

T.

Letter to the Rev. Thomas Madge, on final Restitution.

Hackney,

October 17, 1818.

SIR,
HAVING, a few years since, stated my objections to the doctrine of *Final Universal Restoration*, through the channel of the *Monthly Repository*, [IX. 343,] it was not my intention again to have solicited permission to occupy the pages of that valuable Miscellany, upon the same subject; and I believe nothing but your letter in the last Number of the *Repository* [p. 562] could have induced me to do it; but so strong is the impression upon my mind, of the candour and clearness, as well as fairness of all the arguments in favour of most of the Christian doctrines, that I have heard from the pulpit or read from the production of your pen, that from the ground you have taken, and the particular manner in which you have expressed your belief on that subject, I am induced to offer a few observations on it to your attention.

With your usual candour you begin by stating, that, as it appears to you, the doctrine of Universal Restoration is neither expressly nor designedly inculcated in any passage of the Old or New Testament; but notwithstanding, from the benevolent character of God, and the scope and design of the Christian revelation, particularly the future high office of Jesus as the conqueror of death, you can never be brought to believe, that the benevolent Parent of mankind could have condemned a great portion of mankind to "everlasting irremediable woe." And here, Sir, I am ready to join issue with you, and farther to declare, that I cannot comprehend that any rational being, having, from proper inquiry, a sincere and firm conviction in the perfections and benevolent character of the Deity, can possibly, at the same time, believe that he has consigned a large portion of his human offspring to eternal torments, for the errors and transgression of his laws in this transitory state of existence. But because God has not denounced against mankind this malignant decree, which does not appear to be the case from a fair interpretation of any passage in the New Testament, it does not therefore follow, that the doctrine of Universal Restoration is true, nor do I

mean to insinuate that you entertain that opinion.

Previous to the promulgation of the Christian religion, so confused and dark were the expectations of a future life in the minds of men, that it may be fairly and confidently asserted, that there was no satisfactory evidence that man would live again after he was dead, and consequently there could be no evidence of his future destination; it is from the revelation by Jesus Christ, as contained in the New Testament, that life and immortality are brought to light, and that there are any declarations about the future destination of mankind: to the Christian Scriptures, then, and to them only, are we to appeal for information on this highly interesting subject. Had they been totally silent on the future disposal of man, I should have most readily joined with you in drawing a deduction from the character of God, that eternal torments could not be true; but I apprehend, that though it should be clearly proved that neither universal restoration nor eternal torments be true, that it is most clearly and distinctly revealed by Jesus and his apostles, what will be the final destination of mankind after death. In our appeal therefore, to the New Testament, I cannot propose a rule that I think ought to be adopted in this inquiry, better than your own, or express it in better language.

"I suppose it will be allowed (you say) that the language of Scripture is employed for better purposes than to deceive or mislead; and though when figurative language is used we are to beware of literal interpretations, yet where the language is plain and literal, where the expression is such as to convey only *one idea, one sentiment which cannot possibly be construed into a metaphor*, it is right to understand it agreeably to its common, accepted signification." Agreeing to abide by this rule of interpretation we will, if you please, go into a fair but brief examination of the future destination of mankind, as declared in the New Testament.

I may venture to lay it down as an axiom, because I believe it is not disputed by Christians, that a broad distinction is made through the Christian Scriptures, between the destina-

tion of the righteous and the wicked after death; that the former will obtain eternal happiness and immortality, and the latter will be punished: the only doubtful point of dispute is, what will be the punishment of the wicked. In examining the New Testament, keeping our rule constantly in view, for I cannot believe you would wish to depart from it to join those who, to support their hypothesis, boldly declare that the words death—loss of life—utter perdition—everlasting destruction—are not to be understood in their common acceptance, but have some other meaning; under such a mode of interpretation, every inquiry into the meaning of the Scriptures becomes so vague and uncertain, that an honest, but judicious searcher after truth, would do well to close a book from which he could obtain nothing but sounds without sense, and words without ideas; but with you, Sir, I can never believe that the language of Scripture was not intended for a better purpose than to "deceive or mislead" us. I will, therefore, beg your attention to a few plain passages which appear to me decisive on the subject.

The language of St. Paul, through most of his Epistles is, that the wicked will suffer death—will perish—will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power; on the contrary, that the righteous will obtain life—everlasting life—immortality: these declarations are not to be found in only one or even a few detached texts of doubtful interpretation; it is the burden and plain tenor of his language through all his Epistles, wherever he has occasion to mention the subject; and in the plainest language, if plain words are to be taken in their common acceptance, in their plain meaning.

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, says, "If ye live after the flesh, you shall *die*, but if through the spirit ye do mortify the deeds of the body you shall *live*." Speaking of their being the servants of sin, he says, "for the end of those things is *death*," and goes on, "for the wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is *eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord." Through all his other Epistles he de-

scribes the wicked as being *lost*—as perishing—being *everlastingly destroyed*, and the righteous as obtaining *life—eternal life—immortality*: and this is his uniform language whenever he speaks on the subject.

Now St. Paul can hardly have ventured to preach a doctrine contrary to the declarations of our Lord; we will, therefore, if you please, examine the meaning of those passages, when considered in connexion with the declarations of Jesus. “It is better (says our Lord) for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, than having two hands or feet, to be cast into everlasting fire: (evidently a figurative expression to denote *destruction* as by fire,) for whosoever will save his life shall *lose it*, but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it; for what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and *lose his own life*?” By a fair and legitimate construction of these texts, we find that the doctrine, as declared by our Lord and the Apostle, is in perfect harmony, and that their plain and distinct meaning is the same, that the wicked will be doomed to **DEATH—LOSS OF LIFE**; and the righteous to the enjoyment of *eternal life—immortality*.

This, Sir, appears to me to be the plain, unsophisticated doctrine of the New Testament, where its language is not tortured by verbal criticisms to support an hypothesis; for whilst there are more than a *hundred texts* in which this doctrine is plainly declared, I will venture to assert, without fear of contradiction, that there is not *one* plain or clear passage to support the doctrine of Universal Restoration.

It does not appear to me, Sir, from the ground you have taken, on which you have built your conclusion, upon this doctrine, (confessedly without positive or clear evidence,) your mind *can* be so completely made up, as not to admit of a reconsideration of the subject; and if, from the arguments and evidence I have offered above, however imperfect as to the manner in which they are stated, you should, adhering to your own rule of interpretation, again examine the evidence, I cannot help believing you will be confirmed in the belief of the Christian doctrine, that the wages of sin is

death, and the gift of God is eternal life, promised to the righteous, (and the righteous only,) by Jesus Christ our Lord.

J. S.

Conclusion of a Discourse relating to the Death of Sir Samuel Romilly.

ON Sunday evening, November the 8th, the following reference was made to the death of Sir Samuel Romilly, by one of the ministers of Lewin's Mead, Bristol, at the close of a discourse from Isaiah xxvi. 8.

“Some of you will have already anticipated the fact, that I have been led to this subject by the distressful event, which, this last week, has deprived a large family of their only surviving parent; society, of a wise and virtuous member; the state, of an able, enlightened and upright patriot; and mankind, of one who viewed the rights of men through the medium of justice and benevolence, and whose steadfast, earnest exertions had long been given to maintain and extend them. Of the soundness of some of his political views, there will be a diversity of sentiments; and on these I am silent, because the pulpit should not be the vehicle of party-politics; but of the principles which directed his public conduct, there can be but one opinion. The integrity and mild firmness which marked his private character, were visible in the whole of his political life; and none but the religious or political bigot can, I think, fail to yield him this tribute of praise,—that, in the best sense, he loved his country, and that he was one of its brightest ornaments.

“But the eye of humanity follows him with the most cordial satisfaction, in his unwearied labours, in the midst of opposition and discouragements, to promote the great objects of political benevolence and equity. If the rights of the poor African were to be asserted, and his oppressors checked or punished, Romilly was his fearless advocate, careless of personal odium or fatigue. If the relations of our own to other nations required it, Romilly was among the first to bring forward and to defend, with the simple earnestness of conscious duty, those grand views of human society, which teach that all nations form a part of the great community of mankind, each

having rights which should be respected and observed by every other;—that political right can never be inconsistent with moral right;—and that the welfare of our own country is not to be pursued by the sacrifice of the claims of others less powerful. His patriotism never made him forget that he was a man. Wherever the rights of conscience were concerned, there we see him, as a senator, taking an elevated rank, nay, standing among the most elevated; maintaining those sacred rights on principles which no circumstances can change. When the interests of the poor required the devotement of his time, (leisure it could not be termed,) and the exercise of his sound and discriminating judgment, we see him zealously devoting both, in that cause which every view of benevolence and sound policy shews to be worthy of both, by shewing, that a permanent reformation in the condition and character of the poor, cannot be effected without a well-directed attention to their education, and a proper regulation of the laws respecting the indigent.

“In *all* these objects, Romilly was found an indefatigable and enlightened labourer; but there is one in which he took the lead, and in which he went on, with dignified perseverance, through the bitter opposition of prejudice, and the still more disheartening indifference of those whose views accorded with his own,—the reformation of our criminal code, connected, as it necessarily must be, with the amelioration, or rather the reformation, of the prevalent system of prison discipline. He lived to see the bitterness of prejudice lessened; and indifference, where one would have supposed that indifference could not exist, but through culpable ignorance, awakened to the claims of social duty. And had he lived a few years longer, he might have seen the triumph, if not the universal adoption, of principles most intimately connected with the prevention of crime, the reformation of the offender, and the good order of society. These principles he long had to advocate, almost unaided, and generally unheeded; but his calm and temperate statements of them, and his persevering, prudent efforts, contributed in an eminent degree, to diffuse

and establish them. The time will doubtless come, when his name shall stand high indeed among the benefactors of mankind; and the distressful gloom which has suddenly involved his earthly course, cannot obscure its past glories. True it is, that thick darkness has come over it, before his sun had reached the western horizon; but its mild effulgence, diffusing good, and contributing to enlighten and to benefit mankind, cannot be forgotten.

“It is cheering to believe, that the melancholy act which has thus removed from bright and unclouded usefulness, one whose loss can, as yet, be fully supplied by no one, was occasioned by the temporary alienation of those clear and vigorous powers of understanding, by which he was so eminently distinguished. It is consolatory to believe, that he was illustrious, not only for his public virtues, but for those which adorn the private walks of life, and for the discharge of Christian duties. He is in the hands of a merciful God; of Him who knoweth our frame, and remembereth that we are but dust. And while this mournful event reads us important lessons, it ill becomes us to pronounce a sentence which God hath not pronounced; or rashly and cruelly to make it a proof that his virtue wanted the support of religious, of Christian principle. Nor let his example be supposed to sanction what, in all common cases at least, must ‘come of evil.’ Had his mind been able to reason, and to decide by the plain dictates of *benevolence*, he could not have failed to come to the conclusion, that duty forbade the deed; for it cut off the wise and affectionate father, when his children most needed his aid and direction; it interrupted the projects of enlightened humanity, where his co-operation and judgment were of essential importance to success; it interfered with the interests of numbers, who had committed them to his care; and it caused distress among multitudes, and anguish among his nearest relatives, which long must be deeply felt, which would prevent his honoured name from being pronounced with all the respect and influence due to it, and make it even painful to speak of the father, the friend and the benefactor: and *religion* would have told

him, (and her voice he would, I trust, have heard as imperative and decisive,) that his duty was patient resignation to the will of his heavenly Father; that he must trust in the name of the Lord; that he must rest his hope upon him; and, in the exercise of quiet submission to that will which is the wisest and the best, seek for some portion of the peace which they commonly possess, whose minds are stayed upon God."

The preacher concluded with some directions of religious wisdom, which the mournful event can scarcely fail to suggest and enforce in the serious, reflecting mind.

Letter relating to Mr. Fox, with his Remarks.

[The following letter being anonymous, we had intended to make no use of it, especially as it was accompanied by a sort of menace, beyond sending it to the gentleman whom it concerned; but he having returned it, with remarks, we now give both papers to the reader.

Ed.]

London,

November 6, 1818.

SIR,
UNDERSTANDING that the Rev. Mr. Fox, in his opening lecture on Antichrist, at Parliament Court, last Sunday evening, was pleased to speak of "*the Baptists as dragging people through the water*," I call on that gentleman to reconcile his assertion with *truth and charity*. He must know that *Baptist ministers* act on conviction, and those *baptized* by them are *voluntarily* yielding obedience to the positive command of Jesus Christ.

I also understand that Mr. Fox added, that "*the Baptists kept away from the Lord's table persons as good, if not better, than themselves!*" As the former declaration was altogether false, so the present allegation is only partially true. The church over which he presides was (and it ought not to be forgotten by him) a *Baptist Church*, and held *free* communion, as also does the neighbouring General Baptist Congregation at Worship Street, under the care of Mr. Evans, who introduced *mixed communion* amongst them. It is, indeed, the case with respect to many churches amongst the Particular and General Baptists.

AN UNITARIAN BAPTIST.

Mr. Fox's Remarks.

W. J. Fox returns the letter of the Unitarian Baptist to the Editor of the Monthly Repository, and will be obliged to him, should he publish it, to subjoin the following remarks.

1. An anonymous writer who publicly calls on a preacher "to reconcile his assertions with truth and charity," and who characterizes those assertions as *partially or altogether false*, should, at least, be correct in his quotations. The only reference to Baptists, in the lecture on Antichrist, was in the following sentence, in an attempt to shew that the assumption of dominion over conscience was not confined to the Church of Rome or to Protestant establishments: *Even Dissenters play their little game of tyranny, and make Christians pass to the Lord's table through the pool of Baptism, or under the forks of the Assembly's Catechism.*

2. That what I actually did say gave offence, I know and lament, but cannot help. The fact is undeniable, that many Dissenting churches refuse the Lord's Supper to believers in Christianity, because they have not been baptized, or do not believe in the Assembly's Catechism, and on various other pretexts; and it certainly is my opinion, that such exclusion is unchristian and tyrannical. There is no warrant for it in the New Testament. The great law of Christian fellowship is, *Receive ye one another, as Christ hath received you, to the glory of God*. My words could only refer to those who maintain that churches have power to "decree rites or ceremonies," or confessions of faith, as pre-requisites to Christian communion; and if the Unitarian Baptist be one of this class, I advise him to study the subject of Religious Liberty in the writings of Robert Robinson.

3. That Mr. Evans introduced mixed communion at Worship Street, and that it is practised by his and other Baptist Churches, is very honourable to the liberality of the parties concerned. I hope they practise it on a better principle than some Pædobaptist churches, where Baptists, though admitted to the Lord's table, are yet considered as upon *toleration only*, and not entitled to full membership. The Baptists at Parliament Court give themselves none of these airs of supe-

riority; they reckon their sprinkled or unsprinkled brethren quite as good Christians as themselves; and knowing my high respect for the talents, piety and learning of many members of the Baptist denomination, and my readiness to do full justice to the services which that party has rendered to the cause of truth and freedom, they have none of that irritable *egoïsme* which discovers hostility where none was felt, and resents the honest notice of a defect as an injurious attack, prompted by spleen, and characterized by falsehood.

4. I greatly respect the Baptist who believes that, by submitting to immersion, he is "yielding obedience to the positive command of Jesus Christ." Equal honour is also due to the conscientious Pædobaptist, Antibaptist, or Probaptist. But it is to be deprecated that any of these appellations, relating as they do to a subject of comparatively small importance, should be made badges of party, pleas for exclusion, or instruments of little, vexatious domination. It is against this intolerance that I protest; while, as to the controversies themselves, I am a mere looker-on. My wish is, to unite heartily and zealously with every friend to "the use of reason in matters of religion," (whatever be his opinion or practice as to the use of *water* in matters of religion,) in endeavouring to lead mankind to the knowledge of Christian truth, and the enjoyment of Christian liberty.

SIR, Swansea, Nov. 16, 1818.

THE scheme of Fellowship Funds, the happy suggestion of your late greatly lamented Correspondent, Dr. Thomson, being now adopted in so many places, and I hope likely to spread through the whole Unitarian body, it becomes the more desirable that some method should be adopted to unite and concentrate their strength. Much good, without doubt, may be done by the various associations of this kind separately; but is it not probable that much more may be done by a general union and co-operation?

Strongly persuaded of this, and zealous for the cause, the members of the Swansea Fellowship Fund are exceedingly desirous that the pages of the *Repository* should keep up the attention of the Unitarian public to

this subject, and afford opportunity for the proposal and discussion of plans: and, at their request, I beg leave to recommend that the gentlemen of the Unitarian Fund in London be, for the present, considered as a central committee for the Fellowship Funds. They desire me also to announce, as an example to others, that they have resolved to transmit a small annual subscription to the Unitarian Fund.

R. AWBREY.

Royal Funeral Sermons.

THE following advertisement, which appeared in "The Times" of the 20th of November, will perhaps furnish a clue for discovery to what quarter many of the loyal effusions, with which the public has been favoured from the press and the pulpit, owe their origin.

Ad Cleros—Ecclesiastæ, quibus non satis [est] otii ad tempestivas conciones componendas, in memoriam *defunctæ Reginæ Charlotte* habendas, exemplaria varia aut MS. non ante prolata, ad rem ritè luctuosam idonea, consequi possint. Adeundum est ad ———

The reference, which is to a book-selling-house of the first respectability, we are of course not able to give.

Postscript to A Constant Reader's Letter, p. 687.

(Which came too late for insertion in its proper place.)

SIR,
SINCE writing the above, I have seen Mr. Howe's letter [p. 625], to whom I beg respectfully to suggest two things which I hope will be deemed conclusive: 1. That the opposing party amongst the Independents have no connexion or influence with the Society, *precisely* because they would not agree to the comprehension of Unitarians, which I consider to be one of its rules as actually carried into effect. And, secondly, That a provision is made for the permanent operation of the same liberal principle in the future management of the society, by a law which declares that the Committee of Management shall always consist of an equal number of persons, part ministers and part laymen, belonging to each denomination. I need not say, that of the Presbyterian denomination, the Unitarians, peculiarly so called, constitute by far the larger portion.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

ART. I.—*Systematic Education, &c.*

(Concluded from p. 637.)

THE art of Logic is, we think, very properly deferred, till at least an outline of Mental Philosophy has been laid before the reader. The youthful inquirer ought to have some general idea of the powers of the human mind, before he is instructed how to exercise them.

Logic is the art by which the understanding is directed in the ascertainment of truth, and in the communication of it to others. It is commonly divided into four parts, perception, judgment, reasoning and method. But the author adopts a division less scientific in form, but better adapted, as he conceives, to answer the leading object above stated. He arranges his matter under the following heads, *Ideas, Words, Classification and Definition, Propositions, Evidence, Sophisms, Syllogisms and Pursuit of Truth.*

For Ideas, as the relics of sensation, variously combined by association, and modified by the exercise of the understanding, he refers to his former section in Mental Philosophy, pp. 249, &c., and only adds a few observations on Mr. Locke's phraseology respecting simple and complex ideas, which, though formed before the doctrine of association had been so thoroughly investigated, on the whole sufficiently corresponds with the Hartleian acceptation of them; on substances—their real essence, of which we know nothing but that, as their resulting properties differ, their essences must also themselves be different, and their nominal essence, which is that collection of properties from which our notions are derived; on modes, essential and accidental, simple and mixed; on relations, which are of great importance, the duties of life depending upon them, and which may be very clear, though the subjects of them may be imperfectly known.

As on the right use of Words depends, in a great degree, the improvement and right direction of our intellectual and moral principles, the

attention which is given by a well-conducted classical education to call into exercise the power of discrimination, and produce accuracy in the choice and use of words, and consequent correctness and distinctness of ideas, is of greater importance than some who have derived mere verbal knowledge are willing to admit. The Author refers here as before to what he had said on words, as influenced by association, pp. 301, &c. He then proceeds to point out the three ways in which names are given to new combinations or modifications of ideas, viz. by the formation of names altogether new, by the combination of old words, and by the extension of terms already in use. Etymology is often of advantage in tracing out the import of words; and also of checking the changes that might otherwise take place in their appropriation. These changes, and the various senses consequent upon them, are a frequent cause of ambiguity; which often also arises from a figurative use of words, and from the intervention of the passions and affections. The meaning of a word may be conveyed in three ways, by observing how it is used in different intelligible combinations, which is the way in which the meaning of most words is learned by association in the periods of early culture; by explaining it by some other combination of words, or by some one equivalent word, which is the definition of the *name*, or by stating the parts and properties of the objects which distinguish it from every other, which is the definition of the *thing*, or definition properly so called.

An acquaintance with Classification is of great importance. A set of individuals agreeing in certain particulars, are thus formed into a *species*; a set of species, which, though distinguishable from each other, have certain points of resemblance, form a *genus*; several genera having common properties, form a *superior genus*; and several of these form a *genus generalissimum*. Modern naturalists have adopted more terms than these two;

dividing each kingdom of nature into classes, orders, genera, species, &c. This fondness for arrangement was carried to a wild excess in Aristotle's attempt to class all the objects of human thought under the ten categories.

The proper definition of a *Definition* is, a statement of those properties of a thing, or circumstances respecting it, which distinguish it from all others. It ought to be clear and plain, precise and intelligible, and bring the object forcibly before the view of the mind.

In the use of words we ought not to employ such as have either no meaning at all, or a loose and indeterminate one, or still less a false one: but should accustom ourselves to use words in a precise and determinate sense; should be careful to ascertain the sense in which others use them; and when distinctions are laid down by writers of authority, respecting the use of words generally considered as synonymous, should aim to observe the distinction, and extend its use. Thus Bishop Watson first fixed the distinction between *genuine*—the work of the person to whom it is ascribed, and *authentic*—containing a true account of facts.

On the mental operations which accompany the statement of a *Proposition*, the author, as before, refers to Mental Philosophy, pp. 308, &c., and then explains the subject, predicate and copula, of which a simple proposition consists: what constitutes propositions identical, equivalent, affirmative, negative, universal, particular, indefinite, conditional, simple and compound.

Evidence, he defines the ground on which we believe a proposition to be true. Certainty expresses the highest degree of conviction; and also supposes, but is not always the result of, the highest degree of evidence. Evidence is derived from the senses, from consciousness, from intuition, (propositions derived from which are called axioms,) from experience, reasoning and testimony. And when by any medium of proof we can establish the divine authority of any proposition, our conviction of its truth must be in the highest possible degree.

The author then gives a short account of the syllogistic form of reasoning; but though short, it is too long to be extracted. The advantages of this

form in giving order and precision to an argument, directing the attention to that position on which the proof depends, and enabling to detect the sources of error, are well stated. Some excellent remarks on this subject are contained in Professor Jardine's interesting work, pp. 132—137, where it is related that Lord Mansfield was once, when pleading, perplexed by an argument which he was convinced was false, but could not detect the sophism, till on going home, and throwing the propositions of which it consisted into the syllogistic form, he instantly discovered where the fallacy lay.

The subject of Logic concludes with some observations on the analytic and synthetic methods of investigation; on induction, analogy, experience, &c.; on the chief causes of erroneous conclusions in scientific researches; and on the qualities and circumstances most necessary to the successful pursuit of truth. The books recommended are the Port Royal, Crousaz, Watts, Duncan's and Kirwan's Logic, Gambier on Moral Evidence, Locke's Essay, and Conduct of the Understanding, and Stewart's Elements, Vol. II.

In the twenty-third and following chapter, we rejoin Mr. Joyce in the study of Political Economy. In his historical introduction, he assigns the reason why the mercantile system was so long predominant in modern Europe; viz. that its improvement began among the manufacturing and commercial classes, and was from them carried to the agricultural. The preference given to commerce by Colbert, led into the opposite extreme many French philosophers, who, under the name of *Economistes*, espoused the doctrine that agriculture is the only source of wealth. Dr. Smith places the source of wealth in labour; Lord Lauderdale in land, labour and capital. Mr. Joyce conceives that these differences are more nominal than real. They all, in fact, acknowledge that wealth is produced by land, labour, capital and commerce; they chiefly differ as to the greater or less share they assign to each.

With regard to revenue derived from land, it must, first, afford the expense of working it, then the rent of the landlord, the proportion of which must vary with the fertility of the soil, the extent of the demand,

and the skill of the cultivator: land also, producing food for man, will regulate the rent of other lands. Spontaneous products depend for their value on circumstances: woods, in uncultivated countries, are a burden to the land; in an improved country, they yield a large revenue: mines depend on various circumstances: river fisheries often produce large rents: sea fisheries in general are not appropriated, though in particular cases claimed, as national property.

But the great source of wealth is labour. Capital is merely accumulated labour; by which, indeed, the possessor obtains lands, purchases implements, enjoys himself, or affords to others subsistence, till the produce of labour is disposed of. What is afforded to others for their labour is called wages, which is regulated, like every thing else, by demand and supply. The supply of labour, or the population, naturally tends to regulate itself by the demand; whether it should be affected by a temporary scarcity, has been made a question, though it certainly must follow any permanent change. Wages in general find their level in the same civil community; though usually higher in towns than in the country; also, where the employment is unwholesome or even disagreeable, difficult to learn, precarious, attended with considerable trust, or with any peculiar risk.

Labour is divided into productive, when the thing produced is permanent, as corn or cloth, and unproductive, where the services perish in the performance, as in the case of professions, public teachers, artists, &c. This definition of Smith's is liable to objection. The Economists think no labour productive, but agricultural; manufactures only change the form of things produced by agriculture; commercial men send it to the consumer; scientific men add greatly indeed to the intellectual and moral enjoyment of society, but however useful, add nothing to the stock of things produced.

Here follows, pp. 456—462, an elaborate attempt to determine whether agriculture, or manufactures and commerce, are more conducive to the welfare of individuals, the prosperity of nations, and their absolute and relative power. The investigation is ingeniously conducted, and terminates

in favour of the latter. Perhaps their mutual dependence is too close and intimate to render it expedient to consider them as opposite interests.

The next inquiry is, into the causes which invigorate labour, &c. Dr. Smith ascribes this to the division of labour; the luminous manner in which he has illustrated the effects of which, has in general afforded such pleasure to his readers. Lord Lauderdale, it seems, ascribes it to machinery, chemistry and capital. The author thinks machines only a modification of the division of labour; and, *en passant*, considers small farms as an exception to the advantages of the division of labour. The question respecting the utility of machines is next discussed; in the consideration of which, and whether they should be allowed, it has often occurred to us, that it has always been too much overlooked how, supposing we determine against them, are we to get rid of them; how are we to stop the workings of the minds of ingenious men? If a Kay invent the fly-shuttle, or an Arkwright the spinning-jenny, the question is not, "shall we put it down?" for that is impossible; but, "shall we take advantage of it ourselves, as long as we can keep it, or drive it and its inventor among our rivals abroad?"

The author next proceeds to the consideration of the various systems respecting *capital*, on which it should seem that much has been advanced to puzzle an apparently plain subject. The abettors of the mercantile system make it consist in metallic currency, derived from foreign commerce: the Economists acknowledge no other capital than advances on cultivation: Dr. Smith includes in capital whatever is advanced for materials, for labour, the improvement of the soil, all implements and machines for carrying on agriculture, manufactures, or commerce, and all commodities reserved for general consumption: Lord Lauderdale limits the term capital to implements and machines: Ganilk defines it, the accumulation of the produce of labour.

Mr. Joyce goes on to represent the theories of the various writers on the formation, employment and influence of capital, on fixed and circulating capital, on the origin of commerce, and the mercantile system, on exports

and imports, and the balance of trade; and, we doubt not, that he has given a clear and comprehensive view of them. But we fear we have already made our readers weary of the subject; indeed, we grow weary ourselves: for this reason we must also pass over all that he has said on revenue, taxes, stock, interest, annuities, &c.

But, as the question of population is in itself so interesting to individuals as well as states, and as the peculiar views of Mr. Malthus are often made the subject of conversation where there is little actual knowledge, it may not be unacceptable to detain our readers by a short account of his celebrated Essay.

Dr. Smith had said, "that the demand for men, like that for any other commodity, necessarily regulates the production of men." Mr. Malthus advances a step farther, and having observed, that population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increase, proceeds to lay it down as a sort of axiom, that there is a constant tendency in animals to increase beyond the nourishment prepared for them, and traces to this source a considerable part of the vice and misery in the world. Assuming, from the instance of North America, that population, when unchecked, doubles in twenty-five years, or in a geometrical ratio, while the means of subsistence, after all the land shall have been occupied, and the yearly increase of food can only depend on melioration of land and its management, cannot possibly be estimated to increase beyond an arithmetical ratio; then, taking the whole earth, which puts emigration out of the question, the human species can only be kept down to the level of the means of subsistence by some powerful checks. These are either preventive, consisting in moral restraint, or destructive, as poverty, bad nursing, vice, diseases, war and famine. No one can hesitate to prefer the preventive to the destructive checks; it follows, therefore, that every effort should be made to discourage helpless and improvident habits, and raise them to a sense of the dignity of their nature. This must be done by good government and education, and whatever tends to raise their respectability and independence. The poor laws have this,

among other bad effects; they tend to encourage marriage between those who have no prospect of providing for their offspring, and take from them every motive to frugality and forethought. They raise the price of provisions by increasing the number of mouths, and those mouths idle ones. He proposes, that the poor laws should be gradually abolished by enacting, that no child, the product of a marriage taking place a year after the passing of the law, shall be entitled to parish relief; and no illegitimate child born two years from the same date. This he thinks would be fair notice; and without pressing hard on any individual, would throw off the rising generation from their wretched spirit of dependence, and all its incalculable evil consequences.

Although the good intentions of Mr. Malthus are evident in every page, he has probably, in endeavouring to avoid one extreme, fallen into the opposite. The system of Providence does not seem liable to the objections which must present themselves to every reflecting person on his scheme. And would not private benevolence be extended in proportion as legislative was withdrawn? And may it not be questioned whether individual obligation might not create a more abject spirit of dependence?

It is but justice to say, that Mr. M. adds, "the precise reason why I wish no more children to be born than the country can support is, that the greatest possible number of those born may be supported. Every loss of a child from the consequences of poverty, must evidently be accompanied by great misery to the individuals concerned; and with respect to the public, every child that dies under ten years of age, is a loss to the nation of all that has been expended on it. A decrease of mortality is what we aim at: for this we must impress on the minds of the young, that to avoid great misery, and secure all the proper advantages of marriage, they must defer it till they have a fair opportunity of maintaining a family. It is not in the nature of things that any permanent and general good can be effected without an increase of the preventive check."

We have only time to observe further, that the chapter on the

Structure and Functions of Man contains an accurate general view of human anatomy, and as its author avails himself of the observations of Paley, it is, so far, a system of Natural Theology. The Letter to a Son, on the Evidences of the Christian Religion, by Mr. Shepherd, is so excellent, that we only wish that a more regular treatise on this important subject had come from the same pen. Indeed, a more expanded view of the evidences both of natural and revealed religion, with proper references to authors, seems all that is wanting to make the work complete.

If we have allowed ourselves to enlarge more than our plan in general admits, on this excellent work, it has been because we thought it of importance to lay before every parent and teacher of youth, who honours our work with its perusal, a full analysis of its contents. This we conceived the best way of convincing them of its importance to the rising generation, to whose careful perusal and study we cordially recommend it.

V. F.

ART. II.—*Religious Liberty, applied to the Case of the Old Meeting-house, John Street, Wolverhampton: including Remarks on the Conduct of the Editors of the Congregational Magazine, and the Resolution of the Congregational Board, July the 7th.* By James Robertson. 8vo. Pp. 80. Conder, 1818.

OUR readers are well acquainted with the case which has called forth the present able and animated pamphlet;* they will, perhaps, some of them know, that a schism manifested itself among the "orthodox" brethren, many of whom demurred to going the lengths to which the "nine ministers," who signed the famous "Case," seemed inclined to carry the evangelical public; but that, after a formal investigation of the subject, the "Congregational Board" has declared as the true faith, that the Wolverhampton Case is well deserving of "orthodox" sanction, and that it has a good "claim upon the

generosity of the evangelical part of the community," in a pecuniary point of view.

Our author, however, a minister who professes his zealous attachment to doctrines discarded by Unitarians, is determined that these proceedings shall not pass without at least *his* solemn protest, and an endeavour to exhort his brethren to the adoption of principles more consonant to the professions which they make as Protestant Dissenters. As he observes,

"It is a fact too evident to be denied, and too painful not to be deplored, that the principles of religious liberty are imperfectly understood by the Dissenting ministers of the present day, and especially by the Evangelical part of them: It is a subject which they appear never to have studied, or if it has occasionally engaged their attention, their consideration of it has been limited to its bearings on their own particular interests: they feel and complain of the pressure of intolerance on themselves, but seem unconcerned as to the manner in which it may affect others. 'Absolute liberty,* just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty,' has certainly not made that progress in the minds of Protestant Dissenters which might have been expected from persons in their circumstances, and with their inducements to cultivate the knowledge of it: the practical freedom of religion is less the result of a distinct and complete acquaintance with its principles, than the effect of the extensive diffusion of knowledge in general."—Pref. p. xiv.

If Mr. Robertson can successfully call the attention of his orthodox brethren to this charge, weighty indeed, but we are afraid too true, he will accomplish a most desirable object. The "orthodox" Dissenters have many grievous sins to answer for, many gross derelictions from those principles which they have loudly required to be adopted by the ruling power, in its conduct towards themselves, notwithstanding they have long felt, too, in their own persons a just retribution, in the restrictions which their own bigotry and intolerance have entailed upon them. Their jealousy of the Catholics loaded themselves and their posterity with the Test and Corporation Acts: they are the persons who refused to concur in obtaining a toleration which the government pressed upon them, because it was stipulated that the liberty granted them should extend to Chris-

* For the various statements, pleadings and remarks on the *Wolverhampton Case*, the reader may consult Vol. XII. pp. 430, 494, 512, 541, 666; and Vol. XIII. 95, 98, 531.

tians of another persuasion: they it was who zealously concurred in excepting from the Toleration Act those who entertained different notions with regard to the Trinity from their own: they are the persons too, who, when the legislature has repealed, unanimously, its penal enactments against their Unitarian brethren, stand forward to contravene the decision which, when it suited their interests, they would hail with deserved applause from Lord Mansfield, and to contend that toleration is but exemption from specific punishment, and that non-conformity with the doctrines of the Church of England is an offence at common law; and this too, they will do to serve an immediate object, even though it is perfectly manifest that such an opinion, if adopted and acted upon by our courts of law, would reach almost every species of nonconformity, and that they themselves would fall the victims of their own short-sighted policy. Mr. Robertson has made an effort to bring these gentlemen to more disinterested and liberal principles and practice, and we trust his appeal will not be unavailing.

On the first appearance of "The Congregational Magazine," which supports Calvinistic views of Christianity, Mr. Robertson was applied to by its Editors to contribute his assistance to it as a writer; but deferred pledging himself, till he saw whether the work was disposed to support "the principles of religious liberty in their true and full meaning." On doctrinal subjects he fully concurs with the Editors. In the first number appeared a statement of "the Wolverhampton Case," with the Editors' sanction. Mr. R. "possessing information too correct to mislead him as to the real character of the case," immediately addressed the Editors for the purpose of undeceiving them. He received a reply, in which the Editors acknowledge their want of correct information on the subject. "It seems," they added, "that the case, as drawn up, is *artfully stated*," and they invited Mr. R. to address a public communication on the subject. He did so; a rejoinder immediately appeared from the ministers, flatly contradicting Mr. R.'s statement, "in violation," as he contends, "of the regard which they owed to truth;" and he was now re-

fused by the Editors the privilege of vindicating himself.

Thus situated, he had no other resource than to appeal to the public in the present shape; he has done so, ably and strongly, perhaps rather more strongly in some few passages which we could point out, than was to be wished; but it must be allowed, that the case was one in which the peremptory contradiction of undoubted facts, challenged as peremptory an assertion of the author's veracity.

"I admit," says he, "that I have at least attempted to speak strongly on the subject of the ensuing pages. Could I do otherwise, and be then entitled to hold my situation as an Evangelical minister, a servant of Christ, and a friend to the liberties and true interests of the human race? In all cases of a similar kind, the consistent Christian has only one duty to perform,—to declare against every appeal to intolerant laws for the purpose of attaching criminality to the professors of religious opinions, even should they be in his estimation in error, and to manifest this feeling by taking part with the persecuted against their persecutors.—I say *persecuted*, because, if the attaching of *illegality* to men on account of their religious profession, be not persecution, I have yet to learn in what manner it is to be defined. It must be remembered too, that the author has written in support of statements which, though undeniably true, have been unblushingly contradicted in a *manifesto*, remarkable only for the deception and concealment which it is intended to impose upon the public. Its authors have assuredly meddled with a business remote from their concerns, and the manner in which they have conducted it, is in the extreme dishonourable. They have adopted and sanctioned proceedings in direct opposition to the laws of Christ, from which the sooner they desist the better. Unknown to the author as they are, he feels no difficulty in believing them to be entitled to much deserved respect, as men and as ministers; but as they have chosen to avail themselves of intolerant laws, and have directed the application of them against their fellow-creatures, and then have boldly, in opposition to the charge, denied that they have done so, it is evident that they have subjected themselves to a severe and just reprehension—to which alone the author confines himself. It is for them to explain for what reasons they have presumptuously denied what they certainly must have known to be true."—Pref. pp. x. xi.

Considering the importance of the subject, and the difference of opinion

which we know has even among many Unitarians been entertained on the merits of the case in question, we shall make considerable extracts from Mr. R.'s pamphlet, at the same time earnestly recommending the whole of it to the perusal of our readers. The case is thus stated:—

"In the year 1813, Mr. John Steward, who then professed himself a Unitarian, was invited by the congregation at the Old Meeting-house, in John Street, Wolverhampton, a congregation avowedly Unitarian, and considered in this character by that gentleman, to become the minister of the place for the term of three years. In 1816, Mr. Steward renounced the profession of Unitarianism, and avowed himself to be a Trinitarian. The congregation, on learning this change of sentiment in Mr. Steward, informed him that he was no longer their minister, and that he must leave. He was allowed three months' longer residence (by courtesy of the congregation certainly, for he could have no right to it), for the purpose of having time to provide himself with another situation. As the consequence of disputes and proceedings originating in Mr. Steward's refusing to quit, the Attorney-General filed an information at the instance of Mr. Mander and Mr. Steward, supported and encouraged by the Dissenting ministers whose names are affixed to the case, to restrain the trustees, uniting with the congregation, from ejecting Mr. Steward. On Thursday, July 17, 1817, the cause was heard in the Court of Chancery, Sir Samuel Romilly, Mr. Hart, Mr. Shadwell, and Mr. Ching, appearing for the plaintiffs, Mander and Steward; and the Solicitor-General, Mr. Benyon, and Mr. Phillimore, for the defendants, namely, the congregation. The grounds on which the congregation was opposed, and the judgment of the court solicited against them, were the three following: 1. That Unitarianism was now illegal, and, therefore, that a Unitarian congregation could not lawfully hold any property. 2. That Unitarianism not being tolerated at the time of the erection of the Meeting-house, and the date of the endowments, Unitarians could not be the lawful possessors of the property. 3. That Mr. Steward, as the minister of the congregation, could not be removable at the will of its members, his appointment being to be considered as for the term of his natural life."—Pp. 8, 9.

Mr. Robertson then quotes the speech of Mr. Shadwell in support of that case, which the ministers have thought proper to sanction and recommend, and which speech he con-

tends, (and it seems to us it is impossible for any one to deny,) contained a principle "most hostile to religious rights, viz. the illegality of a particular religious profession according to the common law." Mr. Shadwell, it will be recollected,

"contended at great length, and with much particularity, that impugning the doctrine of the Trinity is at this moment an offence indictable at common law. That Christianity, as maintained in the Church of England, is part of the common law, and that the doctrine of the Trinity being part of this Christianity, an offence against it was indictable at common law, the repeal of the penal statutes which inflicted a specific punishment on the offence, not altering in any respect the nature of the crime, which was still in the eye of the law blasphemous and wicked. Referring to the case of Mr. Wright, at Liverpool, he reminded the court that prosecutions were, at that very moment, pending against individuals for impugning the doctrine of the Trinity. Unitarian doctrines, he asserted, were blasphemous and wicked, and the professors of them ought not to be protected by the court."—Pp. 10, 11.

If these arguments were used, about which there can be no doubt, and if they are appropriate and necessary to support the case patronized by the ministers, as cannot be denied without great disparagement to the judgment and legal knowledge of their counsel, these gentlemen seem involved, in no small degree, in the odium which must attach to such principles, especially when issued under the sanction, and at the expense of a body of Dissenters. One main point, then, at issue between them and Mr. Robertson, arises from their endeavour to evade the charge thus brought against them, which they do, by flatly denying (to use their own words) "that they ever solicited, or sanctioned the soliciting of any proscription of the common law, for the purpose of disqualifying and excluding from common rights any class of religious professors."

To this, Mr. Robertson replies as follows:—

"The cause of these gentlemen, originally bad, they have made worse by their manner of defending it. 'The argument of which J. R. complains,' they say, 'was adduced, certainly not as a reason against Unitarianism, but as a proof of the intention of those who founded the meeting-house, and to explain the foundation deeds.' I

must entreat the allowance of my readers for the plainness which I feel myself compelled to use on this occasion. I say, then, with all deliberation, I weigh my words,—that these ministers have, in the preceding sentence, written in *direct opposition to truth*, they have subscribed to a falsehood. The argument was certainly used, I say the argument *was used as a reason against Unitarianism*. It was used in relation to *present times*, to the profession of Unitarianism at the *very moment* of its being employed in court. The argument is, that the repeal of the penal statutes against Unitarians, (which repeal did not take place till 1813, on the motion of Mr. William Smith,) did not legalize *Unitarianism*, but left it an offence *STILL indictable at common law*. Was the reference to the prosecution of Mr. Wright, at Liverpool, for maintaining religious opinions illegal according to the common law, for impugning the doctrine of the Trinity, in 1817, ‘used as a proof of the intentions of the founders of the meeting-house’ at Wolverhampton, in 1701: was it used ‘to explain the foundation deeds?’ The argument *was distinctly and pointedly used as a reason against Unitarianism*: and no person designing to speak truth would ever say it was not. The ministers, therefore, stand charged with the publication of an untruth. They have given their names and their asseverations to the denial of a fact which admits of no contradiction.”—Pp. 13, 14.

“I will not permit them, or any other persons whatever, be they who they may, to give a denial to any statements which bear my signature, without endeavouring to obtain a determination on which side the truth is to be found. My statements shall not be borne down by the dogmatical but false assertions of any men. I renew my previous affirmations: I have produced the evidence of their truth, and I feel no hesitation in pronouncing the conduct of the persons whom I now oppose as inconsistent with honour as it is with truth.

“The argument directed against Unitarianism by the patrons of the Wolverhampton case is, that the repeal, by Mr. William Smith’s Bill, of the statutes inflicting penalties upon the professors of Unitarianism only relieved them from the specific penalties imposed by the repealed statutes, but still left them under the imputation of crime, and indictable at common law! And had the patrons of the case in Chancery, the nine Dissenting ministers, forgotten that this very argument is alleged by high legal authorities against themselves? The Toleration Act, W. M. i. 18, is ‘An Act for exempting their Majesties’ Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of certain laws.’ Blackstone, in his Com-

mentaries, maintains that nonconformity to the Church of England is still a crime, notwithstanding the Toleration Act, which he considers as only *suspending or mitigating* the punishments, not removing the crime of nonconformity. Nor is Blackstone the only one of the English judges who has maintained this doctrine. Since Blackstone’s time, it is true, the Toleration Act has been amended; its real character and design, its title and its purposes, however, are still the same, the Statute 52 Geo. III. c. 155, being only an amendment, not a repeal of the former Act.

“If, therefore, Unitarianism be illegal at common law, notwithstanding the repeal of the statutes which inflicted specific penalties upon the profession of it, all dissent from the Established Church is illegal according to common law: nonconformity of every species is a crime. If the repeal of penal statutes restores the professors of Trinitarianism to a legal capacity, it must also restore the professors of Unitarianism to a legal capacity; if it removes the imputation of crime as well as the infliction of punishment from one species of nonconformity, it must remove it from another—from every species of Dissent.

“But at this time—with all the unrighteous acts of the ages that are past, and the mischiefs which they produced, as they poured their tides of vengeance upon the unoffending and the virtuous who regulated their religious opinions by a divine law which required them to obey God rather than men, demonstrating the absurdity and iniquity of restraining religious opinion by human authority;—with these melancholy examples and lessons before their eyes—at a time when the illuminations of knowledge are throwing their light upon all questions interesting to the moral probationers of earth, and the feelings of mankind are under the strongest excitement towards objects that include the consideration of their improvement as intelligent beings, the subjects of religion who must shortly give an account of themselves to God—when the ignorant and the forlorn, for whose instruction preceding generations had but ill provided, are taught and encouraged to shew themselves men, the creatures of God and the subjects of his government, by the Bible circulated to their remotest dwellings, and fixing all their attention upon the word that ‘shall judge them in the last day’—at this time, when the messengers of Christ, founding all their measures on his authority, and employing nothing but his word as the means of effecting the objects of their mission, are abroad in all lands, assailing superstitions, inveterate, and powerful in all their associations with the hopes and fears of men, and not deterred from any of

their attempts to destroy them, by the patronage which protects them;—in these circumstances, when strong in the confidence that knowledge is preparing the purest pleasure for every man who loves his species, for every Christian who loves his Saviour, religious men are fixing their attention on its free advances, and wish for nothing but its unchecked circulation—at such a time as this, for ministers of the New Testament to exhibit their cause in connexion with legislative prohibitions and common law proscriptions, is a spectacle strange and unholy, and calculated to excite only one feeling in every generous mind, that of entire abhorrence.”—Pp. 15—18.

It is perfectly obvious that the rule contended for by the patrons of the Wolverhampton Case, would proscribe even the most “orthodox” of Nonconformists. If the Christianity maintained in the Church of England, is the common law of the land, who will escape?

“Will these advocates for the common law be pleased to tell us who is the expounder of its religious doctrines? Who are the persons charged with the official duties of explaining the theology of the common law? I should like much to know the tenets of religion which they would approve. They might maintain the doctrine of the Trinity, but would they hold it in connexion with an Evangelical creed? The doctrine of the Trinity is, we well know, received by thousands who are most hostile to the mode of preaching practised by the patrons of the Case, and who think a Calvinistic creed most dangerous to the interests of mankind, as they assert it to be contrary to the truth of Christianity. Suppose the interpretation of the common law theology to be committed to persons of this description, with power to indict and punish those whom they might pronounce offenders against the common law, we might perhaps have Bishop Tomline’s ‘Refutation of Calvinism’ provided as the test of orthodoxy; and how would the nine ministers relish the application of the common law in this way to themselves? What would they gain by setting up the common law as the test of doctrine? Their assent might be required to other tenets than the doctrine of the Trinity by their judges, who, were they even agreed with them on this topic, might still find enough in their profession to charge them with opinions not according to common law, but indictable by it.

“They who make laws to restrain one class of religious professors, can make laws to restrain another: nothing is wanting for this purpose but the possession of political power.”—Pp. 19, 20.

“These nine ministers have proposed their case as ‘a great and good undertaking,’ and as ‘a valuable precedent.’ Yes: ‘a valuable precedent!’ The doctrine of the Trinity as part of the law of England, the Christianity of the common law, is it seems to be applied to all Protestant Dissenting congregations in the kingdom, and the societies that shall be found to have deviated from this standard of doctrine, are to be deprived by law of the meeting-houses in which they now assemble. In like manner, all Dissenting congregations are to be examined; and should it be found that any departure from the tenets and practice *originally* professed in them has been introduced, they must make their exit, or be expelled by law! These measures will create offices among us, very much resembling the ‘Holy Office,’ for which, doubtless, candidates are already provided. It is a fair demand, that those who propose any measure as ‘a valuable precedent,’ should comply with all the terms included in their own propositions. Let the ministers, then, who propose the case of Wolverhampton Meeting-house, as ‘a valuable precedent,’ undergo their examination, and prove their own qualifications, ere they appear in our societies, ‘to cast out all things that offend.’ Will they subscribe, *ex animo*, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and with these in their hands, examine the ministers and hearers in every place of worship, provided ‘for the service and worship of God,’ and ‘for the use of Protestant Dissenters?’ If it should be decided, that ‘baptismal regeneration’ is part of the Christianity of the common law, will they profess their belief of it, and pronounce all contrary doctrine in Dissenting congregations *illegal*? And who are these nine Dissenting ministers, that propose to ‘try the spirits,’ by the maxims of the common law? I should have thought that men in their situation, would have for ever remembered the outrages committed against the ‘*illegal*’ professors of Unitarianism in 1791, and with the fiery beacons, and the desolations of their neighbourhood, admonishing them of the consequences of attaching an obnoxious character to men on account of their religious opinions, would have eternally abstained from tampering with intolerant laws.”—Pp. 22—24.

Mr. Robertson then enters warmly into his defence against the appalling accusation brought against him, of being “a bigot to laxness,” one “who would have no checks and precautions to hinder a religious society from running into error”—who seemed inclined, in short, “to give the same advantages to the cause of Christ and

Antichrist." The employment of *political* checks, if this is what is meant, he of course protests against most strongly :—

"And are not *moral means*, which are the only proper means for religionists to use in support of their principles and practice, the same to all, equally accessible to Trinitarians and Unitarians? If the former can preach, so can the latter. If the one can write and publish, so can the other. Nothing can be more evident than that moral means are the same to all parties, the only difference which it is possible to consider as existing between them, being the essential difference of truth from error. 'Give advantages to the cause of Christ,' and what advantages would they *give* it? They would have it placed under the protection of secular courts, they would have themselves as its friends, to walk abroad and breathe at large under the guardian care of the laws of England; and they would have impugnors of the doctrine of the Trinity, and 'such as have removed to the greatest distance from the truth,' of which deviation they must, to be sure, be the judges, made indictable at common law. These are their advantages.

"This giving of advantages, however, they should have considered may happen to be in other hands than theirs. If moral means be abandoned as strictly and exclusively the proper ones for checking and preventing a religious society from running into error; or, which is the same thing, for recovering them from error, then they who have most advantages to give, may flourish and prosper most. And it is very easy to see the effects of thus attempting to check and controul what has been regarded on the one hand as the cause of Christ, and on the other as the cause of Antichrist. Charlemagne was giving advantages to the cause of Christ, certainly so he thought, when he forced the Saxons, under pain of death, to submit to baptism. Henry the Eighth was giving advantages to the cause of Christ, of which he was styled the defender, when he enacted the six bloody articles,—Cranmer when he put Joan Bocher to death,—and Mary when she sent Cranmer to the flames."—Pp. 25—27.

Our Author then proceeds to remark upon the conduct of Mr. Steward, the person held up as "a proper object of the generosity of the evangelical public."

"The authors of the 'Reply' are mighty boasters of their regard to truth and justice. We have already seen how they regard these. Now follows another specimen of their attachment to the latter.

They avow 'a stern, inflexible support of the cause of justice, whosoever may suffer, or whatever interests may be overturned.' And that this avowal may be duly noticed, it is marked by the emphatics of the press. Well, let us examine their heroic integrity.

"Mr. Steward was invited by the congregation at Wolverhampton, to become their minister for a stated time fixed by them. He was then an *avowed Unitarian*, the congregation too was Unitarian, and on the mutual cognizance of Unitarianism as the religious profession of the parties, the limited invitation was given and accepted. On his change of sentiment, had Mr. Steward any other alternative than to declare it and resign his situation? Would not a man who felt the claims of Christian integrity, have quitted a station which he could no longer consistently retain? Mr. Steward, however, did not adopt this course; he continued to hold his situation, and when the congregation, on ascertaining that he had adopted other sentiments than those which they approved, and which they made the condition of his being minister of the place, gave him his dismissal—Did he remove? No: he united himself with an opponent of the congregation, he seized the property, he asserts his right to it to the exclusion of the society; and he puts himself forward, as the legal opponent on religious grounds, of the very persons with whom he stipulated that his service should be dependent on their will, and now represents them as obnoxious to the law on account of their religious profession, which was so lately his own. And in this most dishonourable conduct he is sanctioned by these 'stern, inflexible supporters of the cause of justice,' the nine subscribing ministers, who represent the attempt to secure his life-interest in the estate as 'a great and good undertaking!' This is their 'stern, inflexible support of the cause of justice.' In vindication of this support given to Mr. Steward, they allege the improper conduct of the congregation towards him during the three months allowed him by the courtesy of its managers. Granted, that the congregation treated Mr. Steward improperly, could that alter the previous obligations of honour and duty, and vacate the principles by which Mr. Steward's resignation and removal were rendered imperative? Are our obligations to acts of justice annulled by the opposition, the erroneous, or even the mischievous conduct of other men? In what school of morals have these patrons of Mr. Steward studied? Where have they acquired this tone of feeling, and learned this magnanimity of justice?"—Pp. 29, 30.

Mr. R. then makes some very judicious observations upon the clause in

the Wolverhampton deed, upon which so much stress was laid, as evidencing the intention of the founders to establish a society to which the Toleration Act extended, and consequently excluding necessarily any Antichristian worship. We have no doubt our readers, on perusal, would come to the same conclusion as he does,—that

“The only evidence which this clause supplies, is, that the persons who inserted it in the deed, had still in their remembrance (how could they indeed ever forget them?) the prohibitions and proscriptions of the preceding times, the suppression of all opinion and worship apart from those of the Established Church.”—P. 33.

“The Society at Wolverhampton,” he proceeds, “was once Trinitarian; its first members were Trinitarians: it is now a Unitarian congregation. It has become such through the prevalence of error among its members. No body of Unitarians from another society has forcibly invaded and taken possession of the place; but the present profession has sprung up and acquired its strength in the original soil, precisely as other errors have predominated in places once pure in profession. Antinomianism in like manner has changed the face of many religious societies; and Antinomianism is surely an error of the worst kind. Is the latter to be cured by either attaching illegality to the persons who profess it, or by expelling them from the situations in which another doctrine was once maintained, that is now subverted by their anti-evangelical creed? Every person acquainted with the writings of the Nonconformist divines, knows, that many of them entertained the strongest possible aversion to Arminianism, against which they manifest the greatest hostility, classing it with Arianism, Socinianism, Deism, and even Atheism. Not a doubt can be felt respecting their opposition to the introduction of Arminian sentiments into the congregations of which they were the pastors, and, in connexion with others, the founders. But if, in any particular case, it should be proved, as it is believed it easily might, that the minister and congregation who have succeeded *seriatim* these professors of high Calvinism, are, in sentiment, more nearly allied to the Arminianism which their predecessors abhorred, than to the rigid Calvinism which they avowed; will it be contended that they ought to be expelled by a legal interference from the place which they occupy? I could refer to several cases of unquestionable deviation in religious opinions, in the present occupants of meeting-houses, professors of evangelical principles, from the tenets asserted by the original worshipers; and

these societies, according to the doctrine of the nine ministers, are to be ejected on account of these differences! What becomes then of religious freedom?”—Pp. 38, 39.

“A number of persons professing Unitarian principles, unite in erecting a place of worship: in the course of time, the congregation assembling in the place as regular successors of the original occupants, become, on the conviction of their own minds, of different sentiments, and avow the doctrines usually held by Trinitarians. Will it be contended, that they should be cast out as the unworthy occupiers of the place? What principle, I should be glad to learn, would require their forcible expulsion? What right, I wish to know, would any persons have to interfere with the change, and discharge the congregation from the occupancy of the premises? If this be good reasoning, as applied to a change from Unitarianism to Trinitarianism, it is equally good when applied to a change of a contrary description. And whatever may be the feeling of persons who can allow themselves to expound religious opinions according to the common law, it is the only reasoning which a man, understanding the nature of religion and the means of supporting it, will permit himself to use.

“The same reasoning applies to other cases. It is of no importance in the consideration of the question under discussion, whether the change be in doctrine or in rites; whether it be a difference of great or of minor consequence: that it be a deviation from the original constitution of a religious society, is sufficient. A pagoda built for Hindoo worship, can never, it seems, be used for Christian devotion; a Mohammedan mosque must remain in *statu quo*, and can never be purified for the use of the followers of Christ. The chantries founded by the lords and knights and dames of other days, with good allowances to the priest for saying daily mass, must be revived; and creeds and aves and paternosters, must be repeated for the repose of Christian souls. Monasteries must be raised from their ruins; abbeys must again elevate their proud heads; and the followers of St. Francis and St. Benedict crowd to their restored habitations.

“If many societies once Trinitarian are now Unitarian, it is also true that many societies, a considerable number of the old Dissenting congregations, were once Presbyterian. I could give a list of places, now before me, the title-deeds of which specify, that the property which they are intended to secure, shall be for the use of ‘Presbyterians.’ These places are now in the hands of Independents, who, according to the very elegant representation of the authors of the ‘Reply,’ have with

cuckoo insidiousness taken possession of nests they never built, and hatch their brood in stolen habitations.' But it seems that they have no right to them! The loose declamation of the authors of the 'Reply' may be directed against Independents, occupants of these places, who have seized upon property belonging to others, and given for the support of another denomination. They propose the case of Wolverhampton Meeting-house 'as a valuable precedent.' Let them proceed in their brilliant career, and their 'stern, inflexible support of the cause of justice,' may overturn some interests that may disturb their own repose."—Pp 41—43.

"The persons who patronize the case of the Wolverhampton Meeting-house, are pleased to say, that 'the liberty for which J. R. contends, is a liberty to violate the testaments, to counteract the most solemn injunctions of our pious ancestors, and to throw down the mounds which they raised against the incursions of error, and in defence of what they regarded as the cause of truth and righteousness.' They should have understood better the subject on which they have attempted to write, and should have shewn a little more propriety in their selection of expressions. What 'testament' have they produced? What 'solemn injunction' have they shewn relative to the Case? What 'mounds of defence' against error have they to exhibit as the work of their ancestors, other than the free use of the Bible, and freedom of worship? These are the only mounds which they raised, the only mounds which it can be shewn they contemplated, and the only mounds which are fit and sufficient for the purpose. But these same patrons have also asked, whether J. R. would 'argue on any other species of property, as he does on that which has been set apart for the service of religion?' Certainly he would. That is his prompt answer to this dogmatical but inconsiderate question. Were J. R. executor to the will of a person, who, he knew, was a Calvinistic Pædobaptist Trinitarian, and who should leave £20 annually to be distributed to the poor of any place, being 'Protestant Dissenters,' he would certainly distribute it to Unitarians as well as Trinitarians, to Baptists as well as Pædobaptists, and this is exactly as J. R. reasons in the Wolverhampton Case."—Pp. 47, 48.

"No congregation of religious professors, who admit the exclusive authority and the sufficiency of the Scriptures, can bind their successors in the place of worship in which they had been accustomed to assemble, to the reception of any doctrine. They have no right to do it. They can judge and determine in matters relating to their own profession, but they cannot dictate to, or controul the consciences

and profession of their successors, who have an equal right with their fathers to examine the Scriptures for themselves, and to exhibit publicly their own sense of its doctrines. The authority which binds in religion, that on which the truths of Christianity are to be received, is a Divine authority; and this we find not in the opinions of our predecessors, but in the word of God. If the former are to oblige us, of what use can the latter be? The inquiry then would be, What did our ancestors believe? and we must endeavour fully to ascertain the sentiments which they professed, for the purpose of exhibiting them to the world. But how much soever this practice may agree with Popery, it does not comport with Protestantism. The Scriptures are our authority, and we receive nothing, we believe nothing, but from them. Our fathers used the liberty, which no man could take from them, of examining the Divine word, and founded their profession upon their own conviction of the truths which they understood to be included in its testimony: they are gone to give account of themselves as to the manner in which they conducted their examination of the Scriptures, and supported the doctrines which they received as from God; and we, having a like account to give, and living in the constant expectation of the judgment that shall try us, have the same duty to perform. The Bible is our religion. We cannot bind those who shall arise after us as occupants of places set apart for Christian worship, nor can we be bound by those who have preceded us. The liberty of the first worshipers, is the liberty of the last: those were exclusively judges of their own rights and duties, and these challenge and appropriate to themselves the same competence."—Pp. 49, 50.

Mr. Robertson proceeds to protest against the claim made by the decision of the Congregational Board, on the purses of the orthodox brethren, for the expenses of the proceedings at law.

"The 'expenses' are for the purpose of paying counsel for their exertions to revive the operations of the common law proscriptions; they are the price paid for arguments to substantiate the illegality of Unitarianism, and for solicitations to degrade and incapacitate men from asserting rights inseparable from their nature and accountability."—P. 52.

"Should a thousand resolutions pass the Congregational Board, declaring that any professors of religion, who have solicited a civil court against other professors, on the ground of the illegality of their opinions, have a claim on the religious public,

they are to be utterly rejected. Such persons have no claim. They have forfeited all right of appealing to the public: all compensation to them on account of such proceedings, it is every man's bounden duty to resist. Let the whole of the expenses in all cases of this kind, be defrayed by the parties themselves, who can so far outrage the principles of the Scriptures, the rights of human conscience, and the decencies and charities of life, as to maintain that any persons on account of their religious opinions are *indictable at common law*. Let no part of them be liquidated by the public, and especially let the evangelical part of the community not suffer themselves to be betrayed into the support of *anti-evangelical* proceedings, though a Congregational Board should recommend the measure."—P. 53.

A question is then asked of the Congregational Board, which does, to be sure, most obviously appear proper to be resolved by gentlemen who are thus advocating the propriety of pinning down congregations to every jot and tittle of the creeds of their forefathers:—

"What right of interference could a Board of *Congregational* ministers have with a place of worship originally *Presbyterian*? They should have taken time to think on the subjects included in their support of the Case, before they passed their resolution respecting it. If, as they decide, Unitarians cannot possess the place, because Trinitarians built it, let them make us acquainted with the reasons why some of the Members of the *Congregational* Board hold possession of places built by *Presbyterians*."—P. 56.

A strong feature of the Wolverhampton Case, was the attempt made by its supporters, "to set aside that controul of Dissenting societies over their ministers, which is the vital principle of their constitution."

"By what honour can they be guided? Is this their 'stern, inflexible support of the cause of justice'—to urge in court, that the ministers of Dissenting congregations should be prevented from being dependent on the people, and then to apply to these very people, whose unquestionable rights they have been attempting to abolish, for money to liquidate the expenses attending the application against their interest? Let Dissenting congregations look around them. It has always been their righteous boast, that they possess the sole and exclusive right of choosing their own ministers—of judging of their qualifications—and of determining the circum-

stances by which the relation of minister and people shall be limited in their societies; but this power, it is now alleged, they ought to possess or exercise—ought to be restrained from exercising. If so, there is then an end to Protestant Dissenters. Religious liberty is a mere name, a mockery, and a priestly dominion is at once established. If the ministers of congregations among Dissenters are to be released from the controul of the societies that elect them, if they are to hold their situations by any other tenure than their will, then are all the principles of their constitution subverted; and it requires no very extensive acquaintance with the history of religion, as the means of providing our sagacity with a true guide to its anticipations, to enable us to predict their overthrow, and the greatest mischiefs to the cause of Christianity, as the consequences of such a violation. Christian societies, it is true, are not to act capriciously; they are to be guided in their conduct towards their ministers by sound discretion; but as they possess the right of electing them, they also have full and independent authority to dismiss them: the one is as essential to their purity and prosperity as the other.

"It is with pain that I again advert to the resolution of the Congregational Board, but I cannot avoid the inquiry which arises from the foregoing exposition of our principles—how could the members of that Board recommend to congregations of Protestant Dissenters, a case hostile to the very essentials of their constitution? What right (for they speak of right) has Mr. Steward to the occupation of the Meeting-house at Wolverhampton? The congregation that chose him, exercised their indubitable right of dismissing him. He became their minister on their own invitation, and he ceased from being such on their intimation that they did not mean to retain him. He refuses, however, to quit the situation, and in violation of all duty, of all decency, adopts a legal process to eject the society because they are Unitarians, what he knew them to be when he made his engagement with them, and in which very character he stipulated with them for a limited time of service. Having himself, at the expiration of that period, avowed a change of sentiment, which, on the declaration of the society that they no longer required his services, necessitated his withdrawal, he holds possession, and goes into a court of law, to charge the congregation with maintaining *illegal* opinions, and to claim the place with all its appendages as his own life-estate."—Pp. 57—59.

"My only reason," says Mr. Robertson, in conclusion, "for entering upon the consideration of this extraordinary case, is, my abhorrence of persecution, and of

every approximation to it. It is a practice fraught with the worst of evils, a practice than which nothing can be more opposed to the will of Christ, nothing more at variance with the proper methods of promoting his interest. It ever originates, in professors of Christianity, in a departure from the spirit of the gospel, which no man that understands it will ever think of supporting by any other than moral means. The teachers of Christian doctrine must limit their ministry to the exhibition of the truths which they believe, and are not permitted the use of any other motives or means than such as arise out of the nature and bearing of those very truths. Their office is, to declare the counsel of God, to bring the messages of mercy to mankind, and to use all persuasion to induce a compliance, on the part of the perishing trans-

gressor, with the offer of salvation. Theirs is 'the ministry of reconciliation,' and how can they fulfil it, but by the utter exclusion of all secular considerations from their feelings and their practice? In their opposition to error and to sin, they can be successful only by a moral force. The powers of the world to come, in the attractions of celestial grace, and the terrors of the Lord, are the instruments which they are authorized to employ in their ministry, which is an office entirely spiritual, removed to the greatest possible distance from every secular occupation. If the ministers who patronize the Wolverhampton Case, had known and felt what was due to their office, we should never have seen them parties to a cause which, as it has been conducted, attaches so much dishonour to their names." —Pp. 60, 61.

OBITUARY.

Rev. S. C. Thacher.

[From the *Christian Disciple*, a Monthly Publication at Boston, United States of America, Vol. VI. No. 5, May, 1818.]

THE REV. S. C. THACHER, late Minister of the New South Church in this town, died at *Moulines*, in *France*, Jan. 2, 1818, ætat. 32. He had long been absent from this country, for the recovery of his health. The following sketch of his character is taken from a discourse delivered in this town, the Sunday after the accounts of his death were received. The form in which the discourse was delivered, is retained, as most favourable to the free expression of the feelings of the author.

"The news of Mr. Thacher's death, although not unexpected, spread an unusual gloom through the large circle in which he moved and was known. When we thought of his youth and virtues, of the place which he had filled, and of the confidence which he had inspired, of his sickness and sufferings, of his death in a distant land, and of the hopes which died with him, we could not but speak of his removal as mysterious, dark, untimely. My own mind participated at first in the general depression; but in proportion as I have reflected on the circumstances of this event, I have seen in them a kindness, which I overlooked in the first moments of sorrow; and though in many respects inscrutable, this dispensation now wears a more consoling aspect.

"I now see in our friend a young man, uncommonly ripe in understanding and virtue, for whom God appointed an early immortality. His lot on earth was singularly happy; for I have never known a minister more deeply fixed in the hearts of his people. But this condition had its perils. With a paternal concern for his character, God sent adversity, and conducted him to the end of his being by a rougher but surer way, a way trodden and consecrated by the steps of the best men before him. He was smitten by sudden sickness; but even here the hand of God was gentle upon him. His sickness, whilst it wasted the body, had no power over the spirit. His understanding retained its vigour; and his heart, as I often observed, gained new sensibility. His sufferings, by calling forth an almost unprecedented kindness in his people, furnished him with new and constant occasions of pious gratitude, and, perhaps he was never so thankful to the Author of his being, as during his sickness. He was indeed removed at length from the kind offices of his friends. But this event was fitted, and, may I not say, designed, to strengthen his connexion with God, and to prepare him for the approaching dissolution of all earthly ties? I now see him tossed on the ocean; but his heart is fixed on the rock of ages. He is borne to another hemisphere; but every where he sees the footsteps and feels the pre-

sence of God. New constellations roll over his head; but they guide his mind to the same Heaven, which was his hope at home. I see him at the extremity of Africa, adoring God in the new creation which spread around him, and thanking him with emotion for the new strength which that mild atmosphere communicated. I see him too in the trying scene which followed, when he withered and shrunk like a frail plant under the equinoctial sun, still building piety on suffering, and growing in submission, as hope declined. He does not indeed look without an occasional sinking of the heart, without some shudderings of nature, to a foreign soil as his appointed grave. But he remembers, that from every region there is a path to immortality, and that the spirit, which religion has refined, wherever freed from the body, will find its native country. He does not indeed think without emotion of home,—a thought, how trying to a sick and dying man in a land of strangers! But God, whom he adores as every where present, seems to him a bond of union to distant friends, and he finds relief in committing them to his care and mercy. At length I see him expire; but not until suffering has done its work of discipline and purification. His end is tranquil, like his own mild spirit; and I follow him—not to the tomb, for that lifeless body is not he—but to the society of the just made perfect. His pains are now past. He has found a better home, than this place of his nativity and earthly residence. Without the tossings of another voyage, he has entered a secure haven. The fever no longer burns in his veins—the hollow and deep voice no longer sends forth ominous sounds. Disease and death, having accomplished their purpose, have lost their power, and he remembers, with gratitude, the kind severity with which they conducted him to a nobler life, than that which they took away. Such is the aspect which this dispensation now wears; how different from that which it first presented to sense and imagination!

"Let me pay a short tribute to his memory. It is a duty, which I perform with a melancholy pleasure. His character was one, which it is soothing to remember. It comes over the mind like the tranquillizing breath of spring.

It asks no embellishment. It would be injured by a strained and laboured eulogy.

"The character of our friend was distinguished by blandness, mildness, equableness and harmony. All the elements were tempered in him kindly and happily. He had nothing of asperity. He passed through the storms, tumults and collisions of human life, with a benignity akin to that which marked our perfect Guide and Example. This mild and bland temper spread itself over the whole man. His manners, his understanding, his piety, all received a hue from it, just as a soft atmosphere communicates its own tender and tranquil character to every object and scene viewed through it.

"With this peculiar mildness he united firmness. His purposes, whilst maintained without violence, were never surrendered but to conviction. His opinions, though defended with singular candour, he would have sealed with his blood. He possessed the only true dignity, that which results from proposing habitually a lofty standard of feeling and action; and accordingly the love which he called forth, was always tempered with respect. He was one of the last men to be approached with a rude familiarity.

"His piety was a deep sentiment. It had struck through and entwined itself with his whole soul. In the freedom of conversation I have seen how intimately God was present to him: but his piety partook of the general temperament of his mind. It was warm, but not heated; earnest, but tranquil; a habit, not an impulse; the air which he breathed, not a tempestuous wind, giving occasional violence to his emotions. A constant dew seemed to distil on him from heaven, giving freshness to his devout sensibilities; but it was a gentle influence, seen not in its falling, but in its fruits. His piety appeared chiefly in gratitude and submission, sentiments peculiarly suited to such a mind as his. He felt strongly, that God had crowned his life with peculiar goodness, and yet, when his blessings were withdrawn, his acquiescence was as deep and sincere as his thankfulness.—His devotional exercises in public were particularly striking. He came to the mercy-seat as one who was not a

stranger there. He seemed to inherit from his venerable father the gift of prayer. His acts of adoration discovered a mind penetrated by the majesty and purity of God; but his sublime conceptions of these attributes were always tempered and softened by a sense of the divine benignity. The *paternal character* of God was not only his belief, but had become a part of his mind. He never forgot, that he '*worshiped the Father.*' His firm conviction of the strict and proper unity of the divine nature taught him to unite and concentrate in his conception of *the Father*, all that is lovely and attractive, as well as all that is solemn and venerable; and the general effect of his prayers was to diffuse a devout calmness, a filial confidence, over the minds of his pious hearers.

"His understanding was of a high order; active, vigorous and patient; capable of exerting itself with success on every subject; collecting materials and illustrations from every scene; and stored with a rich and various knowledge, which few have accumulated at so early an age. His understanding, however, was in harmony with his whole character. It was not so much distinguished by boldness, rapidity and ardour, as by composed energy, judiciousness and expansiveness. You have an emblem of it in the full, transparent and equable stream spreading around it fruitfulness and delight. His views were often original and often profound, but were especially marked by justness, clearness, and compass of thought. I have never known a man, so young, of riper judgment, of more deliberate investigation, and of more comprehensive views of all the bearings and connexions of a subject, on which he was called to decide. He was singularly free from the error into which young preachers most readily fall, of overstating arguments, and exaggerating and straining the particular topics which they wish to enforce. But in avoiding extravagance, he did not fall into tameness. There was a force and freshness in his conceptions; and even when he communicated the thoughts of others, he first grafted them on his own mind, so that they had the raciness of a native growth. His opinions were the results of much

mental action, of many comparisons, of large and liberal thinking, of looking at a subject on every side; and they were expressed with those limitations which long experience suggests to others. He read with pleasure the bold and brilliant speculations of more adventurous minds; but he reserved his belief for evidence, for truth; and if the most valuable gift of the understanding be an enlarged, discriminating judgment, then his was a most highly-gifted mind.

"From a mind so balanced, and a taste so refined, we could hardly expect that fervid eloquence which electrifies an assembly, and makes the speaker for a moment an absolute sovereign over the souls of men. His influence, like that of the great powers in the natural world, was mild and noiseless, but penetrating and enduring. That oratory, which overwhelms and bears us away like a torrent, almost always partakes of exaggeration and extravagance, and was therefore incompatible with the distinguishing properties of his mind. His imagination was fruitful and creative; but, in accordance with his whole character, it derived its illustrations more frequently from regions of beauty than of grandeur, and it imparted a colouring, at once rich and soft, and a peculiar grace to every subject susceptible of ornament. His command over language was great. His style was various, vigorous, un-borrowed; abounding in felicities of expression, and singularly free from that triteness and that monotonous structure, which the habit of rapid composition on familiar subjects almost forces on the preacher, and which so often enervate the most powerful and heart-stirring truths. His character as a preacher needs no other testimony than the impression left on his constant and most enlightened hearers. To his people, who could best judge of his intellectual resources and of his devotion to his work, his public services were more and more interesting. They tell us of the affluence of his thoughts, of the beauty of his imagery, of the tenderness and earnestness of his persuasions, of the union of judgment and sensibility in his discourses, and of the wisdom with which he displayed at the same moment the sublimity and practica-

bleness of Christian virtue. They tell us, that the early ripeness of his mind did not check its growth; but that every year enlarged his treasures and powers. Their tears and countenances tell us, more movingly than words, their deep sorrow, now that they shall hear his voice no more.

"Of his social character I need not speak to you. No one, who ever met him in a friendly circle, can easily forget the attraction of his manners and conversation. He carried into society a cheerfulness, a sunshine of the soul, derived partly from constitution, and partly from his bright, confiding views of religion; a delicacy, which instinctively shrunk from wounding the feelings of the humblest human being; a disposition to sympathise with every innocent enjoyment; and the power of communicating with ease and interest the riches of his mind. Without effort, he won the hearts of men to a singular degree. Never was man more universally beloved. Even in sickness and in foreign lands, he continued to attract friends; and it is our consolation to know, that his virtues drew from strangers much of that kindness which blessed him at home.

"In his sickness I was particularly struck with his submission to God, and his affection for his people. His submission seemed entire. There was no alloy of impatience or distrust. His sickness was a severe trial; for his heart was bound up in his profession, and if in anything his ambition was excessive, it was in his desire to enrich his mind by laborious study. He felt deeply his privations, and he looked forward to an early death as a probable event. But he bowed to Providence without a murmur. He spoke only of the divine goodness. 'I am in God's hand, and his will be done,' were familiar sentiments, not uttered with common-place and mechanical formality, but issuing, as his tones and countenance discovered, from the very depths of his heart. A firmer and calmer submission could hardly have been formed by a long life of suffering.

"His feelings towards his people seemed at times too strong for the self-possession and calmness by which he was characterized. Their kindness overpowered him. The only

tears, which I saw start from his eyes, flowed from this source. In my last interview with him, a day or two before his voyage, I said to him, 'I trust that you will return, but I fear you cannot safely continue your pastoral relation. We have, however, another employment for you, in which you may be useful and happy.' He answered, 'If I get strength I shall use it for my people. I am willing to hazard my life for their sakes. I would preach to them, although the effort should shorten my days.' He added, 'Should I forsake my people after the kindness I have received, the cause of religion and of the ministry might suffer; and to this cause I ought and am willing to make any sacrifices.'

"Such is a brief sketch of our lamented friend. He was one of the most blameless men, of the most devoted ministers, and of the fairest examples of the distinguishing virtues of Christianity. He has gone, I doubt not, to a better world. Let us hear him from his new abode admonishing us of the frailty of life, and assuring us of the happiness of a Christian death. The removal of the excellent ought to carry our thoughts to Heaven. That world, how delightful is it, as the resort of all the good from all regions of the earth! Are our steps tending thither; and, when we die, shall we leave behind us recollections, which will encourage our friends to look up and to say,—They are at rest in Heaven?"

Sept. 30, at Exeter, Mrs. ANN AVIS, sister of the late Dr. Rice Harris. A gradual decay of nature brought her gently down to the grave in her 78th year.

Nov. 2, at his house in Russel Square, London, in a delirium, (brought on by grief for an excellent wife, who died a few days before, at Cowes, in the Isle of Wight,) which armed his own hand against himself, Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY, aged 59 years.

The death of that distinguished individual, to whose memory we have this month the sad duty of paying a feeble tribute, has given a shock, wholly without example, to every heart which cherishes a hope for the advancement of its species. Never was human expectation so fearfully baffled, or the brightest prospects of philanthropy dashed with so awful a gloom. The friends of that holy cause, to which the noble ener-

gies of Sir Samuel Romilly were, a few short weeks ago, consecrated, had almost begun to forget that he was not, in earthly being, immortal. His name had been so long and so closely identified with principles which can never perish,—his progress seemed so secure in its very gentleness of continuance,—his whole demeanour appeared so formed to procure for his designs gradual but beneficent successes,—that, while the mind contemplated the completion of these objects for which he struggled, through a long vista of prudent enterprises and noiseless triumphs, it learned insensibly to link his personal existence to their duration, and scarcely adverted to the possibility that his span of life might be passed before truth should have achieved its final victory. How fearful then was the blow by which this spell was rudely broken!—This honourable career, which the soul felt refreshment in thinking on, closed in horror; and the sweet dreams of golden days, led on by the favoured agent of mercy, were changed, in an instant, to thoughts of agony, despair, and the grave!

If, however, the mode of Sir Samuel Romilly's removal from the world deepens our grief, it alters not, in the least, our rational estimate of his character. It breaks in, no doubt, upon the harmony of that picture on which the imagination would otherwise have delighted to repose. It was a sad and uncharacteristic close of a life so placid, so gentle, so animated with generous zeal, yet so guided by practical wisdom: but our regrets on this subject extend no further. His conduct from his youth proves, beyond a question, even were the fact unestablished by more immediate evidence, that Sir Samuel Romilly could never have formed a determination to quit the world merely because he imagined that it had left him nothing personally to enjoy. His whole public life was a continued self-sacrifice. Endued with the most exquisite relish for domestic joys, he resigned them, almost without reserve, to his cause; and while tremblingly sensible of misery, he steeled his mind with heroic resolution to investigate its minutest details. He was wedded to the loftiest interests of his species. If a beloved family had not survived to claim his love and to solace his afflictions, he would have found a thousand ties to existence in the apprehensions, the hopes, the struggles of humanity with which he was so generously allied. His death, by an act of the will, would have been the result of a selfishness of which he is proved incapable by the whole tenour of his being: and while it appears a moral impossibility that he should have voluntarily relinquished life, it is easy to trace the causes of the frenzy which destroyed him. Its foundation had been laid in years of inconceivable and dis-

tracting labour, during which he had been literally "prodigal of his mighty soul." His intellect had, day after day, to disentangle the most tedious perplexities, to grasp the most comprehensive masses of facts, probabilities and reasonings; to glance on a multitude of important subjects, and to retain and arrange them all; to rush from the minute details of the nicest legal proceedings to great questions, involving the honour and happiness of man. He hurried from toil to toil—long arguments at the bar alone diversified the dreariness of his professional exertions, and the opposition bench in the House of Commons was his only relief from the unutterable distraction of his engagements in the Court of Chancery. Thus were his nerves, always finely strung, disordered; his delicate organization deranged, and his faculties too painfully excited long to endure. The springs by which his spiritual nature should have been nourished and invigorated, were dried up within him. Harassed, fatigued, bewildered, inwardly exhausted, he was little prepared to bear the severest of earthly trials. The beloved wife, who, with his children, alone shed a tinge of social joy over his career of toil, was laid on a death-bed; suspense agitated his frame already shaken; despair and agony succeeded; and his mind sunk at last, after no unworthy effort, to reassert her seat. His habits, and even his natural constitution of mind, had compelled him to feel the affliction in all the chillness of its reality. He was essentially a practical man, destitute, for the most part, of fancy and imagination; and accustomed to view the apparent only as the real; to relieve actual misery, to combat substantial oppressions, and to strive for objects, valuable indeed, but little known, back from the sphere of ordinary existence. Hence he was little prepared to draw consolation from things unseen; to rest on sentiment or unearthly hopes; to cherish sweet fancies and tender thoughts which soften the grief that incites them, or to indulge in that gentle pensiveness which throws a rich, yet sober enchantment over the grave. Surely, then, it is not wonderful that his heart, exhausted in the cause of virtue, fainted within him; and that the silver cord, so long too intensely drawn, was, in one sad moment, broken.

From the painful contemplation of Sir Samuel Romilly's death, we may turn for comfort to the thought, that it is good indeed for man that he has lived. Humanity regarded him as the first and noblest of its advocates. He possessed, indeed, no faculties of the loftiest intellectual order, no brilliant wit, no intuitive perception, no exquisite felicity of combination, no wild and burning energy: but he united in himself more capabilities of virtuous

enterprise, more resources for the practical benefit of mankind, than any individual whom we have the happiness to remember. His talents as a parliamentary speaker, his wonderful power of intellectual toil, his pure and unsullied life, and the exquisite sympathy he felt for every human sorrow, gave him an influence over prejudice and power themselves, which he used for the purest and loftiest purposes. His wonderful knowledge of the principles and detail of his profession, which usually unfits its possessor for an extended scene of action, was applied with great success by him to promote the cause of improvement, and to justify, if not to rouse, the most generous impulses. He was able to meet prejudice on its selected ground, and to employ the weapons it had chosen; but he wielded them with a spirit that nothing but high principle could inspire. As a speaker, he was clear, chaste and impressive, rising only with his subject, and deriving all his earnestness and force from his strong persuasion of the truth and the greatness of his theme. His voice was sweet and silvery, his action gentle, his manner impassioned only when a strong sense of justice lighted up his frame. Then a holy fire appeared to flash from his else care-worn and quiet countenance, and to "o'er inform his tenement." Over his earthly frame, disease and affliction have for a while triumphed; but they have no power over the virtues he manifested or the principles he lived to develop: these are a possession to the world for ever. His unwavering opposition to all that he believed injurious to human happiness; his disdain of the allurements of an ordinary ambition; the efforts in which he exhausted the resources of life, will never be forgotten, while a pulse shall vibrate in sympathy with the interests of man. The present age, we may venture to predict, will not be the brightest era of his fame. That he exposed unconstitutional measures, rendered the bankrupt laws more just, and the criminal code less unmerciful, are the most visible but not the most important of his peaceful victories. He has reduced, in some degree, those mighty principles of legislation into actual working, which had been long confined to philosophic schools; he has prepared the way for a reconciliation of humanity and law, so seldom permitted to unite; and has begun to give an "assured reality" to the objects of which other philanthropists have been contented to dream. In that day, when the great designs he partially unfolded shall be complete, his memory will be cherished with a reverential fondness. When genuine Christianity shall shine forth in human institutions; when the enactments of man shall be framed in devout imitation of the merciful dispensations of

heaven; when laws shall have become the well-ordered channels for diffusing a wise and genial charity over the world; mankind will not be unmindful of him to whom they will owe the beginnings of their glory and the high example whose inspiration will be caught by a brilliant succession of yet more triumphant labourers.

T. N. T.

Nov. 11, at his house, in *South Street, Exeter*, Mr. WILLIAM DREWE, aged 52 years. It never can be uninteresting or useless to reflect upon the virtues of good men, let them be of ever so obscure a station, or quiet an ambition. Virtue ought never to decay; it should be embalmed wherever it is found. Honour is ever the most pure, the less it is beset with temptations; and therefore it may be that the exalted man is not always the most mentally noble or feelingly great. The object of the present sketch was of a most respectable and private station in life; and he was, perhaps, one of the gentlest and most amiable of men that ever breathed. He lived undisturbedly to the hour of his death in the bosom of his family, in all of whom there seemed to be but one heart. He had no desires, no fears, no aims, no hopes, with which they were not blended; and he never gave them cause of fear till he was ill, nor of anguish till he died. Of a mind singularly quiet and pure, he thought of no evil himself, and never tainted others with "suspect of crime." His days were as full of serenity as his nights, and his morning thoughts were always clear and worthy of the morning. Those who were in habits of intimacy with him, spoke of him in his life-time with unmingled affection and respect: they think of him now, and utter his name with an unaffected and serious sorrow. It is not possible to conceive of a heart more full of humanity, than that which beat but to be charitable and to be happy; it was rich in that benevolence which "hopeth all things, endureth all things." There was a kind of sweet and childlike simplicity in his manners, that bespoke a life, beautiful, unaltered, stainless. His feelings of youth remained unsullied, and had never left his heart; the innocence of his boyhood had not been banished or bruised by the ruthless rudenesses of the world. The benignity of his nature remained faithful to him through every change and chance; and we saw him, in a comparatively advanced age, as "white of soul" as an infant could be. Nothing of the world obstructed his view back into the brightness and placidity of his youthful days. He felt for the distresses of all his fellow-creatures, and as far as in him lay, he removed or mellowed them. With all this suavity of temper and gentleness of feeling, he held high and unshaken

principles, political as well as moral; and it would be impossible for any one to point out an action of his life, in which interest or any other unworthy cause swayed him from what he deemed the good, the generous and the just. Benevolent to the helpless and to the poor, placid and courteous to strangers, invariably kind to his friends, and most mild and affectionate to his family,—he went to his grave universally beloved and mourned. It should be some alleviation to the sufferings of the unfortunate survivors, that he for whom they grieve is gone to a sure and a deathless happiness, if mortal honour and virtue can ensure it. He was taken away neither abruptly, nor after long and wearisome and torturing illness: a warning was given to him, and to those who loved him; and death was led on by a charitable and merciful preparation. In religion, a more just, firm and calm mind could not exist; and he is gone to reap those rewards, for which in life he sowed the seeds.

A few words may, perhaps, be allowed personally from the individual who writes these genuine but hasty words of Mr. Drewe's worth. He was the kindest and the gentlest and the sincerest friend that this individual ever knew; and his placidity and "even-handed justice" were continually the models for his own actions of the heart and the mind. His quiet goodness in trouble; his mild and sincere delight in the writer's happier hours; his easy, unassuming sociability at all times; were and are sureties for a never-decaying love and an unbroken remembrance in him who is spared yet a little longer. He never uttered a word which the writer of these lines did not think kind and generous. But from a world of trial and trouble, he is gone to the home of the benevolent and the habitation of the just: he is now in

a world "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest."

J. H. R.

The Queen.

[From the Gazette.]

Whitehall, Nov. 17, 1818.

THIS day, at one o'clock, the QUEEN departed this life, to the inexpressible grief of all the Royal Family, after a tedious illness, which her Majesty bore with the most pious fortitude and resignation. The many great and exemplary virtues which so eminently distinguished her Majesty throughout her long life, were the object of universal esteem and admiration amongst all classes of his Majesty's subjects, and render the death of this illustrious and most excellent princess an unspeakable loss to the whole nation.

Nov. 18, Mr. ALDERMAN GOODBEHERE, of London. He was seized with more than one fit on the same day, and the last was fatal. His character was highly amiable and respectable; and he was one of the few aldermen of the metropolis who retain on the bench the principles of civil and religious liberty which they professed before they were elevated to it. He was next year to have entered upon the mayoralty.

— 21, at Rochdale, aged 56, ELIZABETH, wife of the Rev. William HASSAL, much lamented as an affectionate wife, a tender parent, a kind friend, and a good neighbour. In her were strongly exemplified the power and excellence of religion, in enabling us to meet the approach of death with coolness and tranquillity of mind.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Fund.

THE Chapel in Meeting-house Lane, Woolwich, late in the occupation of an Antinomian congregation, but which was originally a Presbyterian chapel, has been engaged by the Committee of the Unitarian Fund, in consequence of the application of a respectable individual in that town, and was opened for Unitarian worship, on Wednesday, November the 18th, by the Rev. W. J. Fox. The service in the forenoon was chiefly attended by the few persons who have already avowed their attachment to the Unitarian cause. In the evening, the chapel, which is capable of accommodating about two hundred persons, was

completely filled, and about fifty more stood, within hearing, about the doors. The object of the sermons delivered on this occasion was to shew that Unitarianism is pre-eminently a scriptural system, founded on the plain declarations of Christ and his apostles, and most congenial with those holy affections and dispositions, which it is the allowed design of Christianity to produce and cherish. The hearers were remarkably decorous and attentive, and a considerable impression was apparently produced. Tracts were afterwards distributed, which were received with great avidity, and promises of serious perusal and consideration. Application was made

for many more than could be immediately supplied. May the good seed, which has been thus sown, bear an abundant harvest!

America an Asylum.

It must needs happen that a country which, like the United States, opens its doors to all new-comers, should be infested with the refuse of the population of Europe. Nor is it wonderful, this being the case, that the Americans should be suspicious of foreigners, and should receive emigrants with coldness. The recollection of this fact should also check Europeans, who, by their cast-off members, contribute to vitiate the American character, in their hasty reproaches of the morals and manners of the whole people of the United States. Some estimates that we have seen of the citizens of the American Republic, would, we sincerely believe, be flagrantly unjust applied to the inhabitants, generally, of New South Wales. We are led to these remarks, by observing in the American newspapers accounts of two persons of notorious character, lately ejected from England. One is the notorious *Frey*, the Jew convert and preacher, who, we are ashamed to say, seems to have been preaching in New York and other places, with unbounded popularity. Why did not his "evangelical" associates in this country put their brethren in America on their guard? The other is the West-of-England girl, who, assuming the character of an Indian Princess who had been shipwrecked off the coast, and taking the name of *Carabboo*, practised such an adroit imposture, two or three years ago, upon the gentry of Bristol and Bath. The following advertisements relating to this lady, appear in succession in *The Democratic Press*, of Philadelphia, September 24, 1817:—

"A full length Portrait of Miss Carabboo will be published this day, at two o'clock, at Mr. Charles's Book Store, No. 32, South Third Street.

"Sept. 24—d3t."

"A Card.—Miss Carabboo returns her most grateful thanks to the ladies and gentlemen who did her the honour of attending the Concert, given for her benefit last night, and begs to inform them, that the second and last Concert, which was fixed for Thursday, the 25th instant, is postponed to a later period, of which due notice will be given.

"Sept. 24, 1817.—1t."

New Unitarian Chapel, Baltimore.

[Extracted from a New York Paper, Oct. 2, 1818.]

A large Unitarian, or first Independent Church, lately erected in Baltimore, under the superintendence of the celebrated architect Godefroy, will compare, it is said, with any public building in the United

States. One of the Baltimore papers gives a full description of this superb edifice, of which some idea may be formed from the following representation of the pulpit:—

"The pulpit is in imitation of the antique rostrum; it rests upon a double square base, the first of verd antique marble of Connecticut,—the second of white Italian marble; the latter is decorated on its front with a bronze ornament, from the antique. The body of the pulpit, which is semi-circular, is made of bird's-eye marble. It is ascended by eight steps on each side, inclosed by a balustrade of an imposing style, the base of which is of verd antique marble. On the landing-places on each side, are to be armed chairs in the Grecian style, ornamented with bronze, for the accommodation of visiting ministers.

"The Organ is described as representing a Colossal antique lyre, the large pipes imitating the strings: two Egyptian columns inclose the whole, the pipes forming their shafts."

Clerical Resignation.

A clergyman in the county of Essex has lately resigned two valuable livings into the hands of the diocesan, the Bishop of London; alleging, that he could not conscientiously hold them any longer, dissenting from many articles contained in the Liturgy of the Church of England. The Bishop, knowing how much the circumstances of the clergyman would be reduced by the loss of his livings, in the handsomest and most friendly manner, before he would accept the resignations, endeavoured to remove his scruples, and to prevail upon him to retain his livings, but without effect.—*Sun*.

THE Unitarian Society has in the press, "The Bampton Lecturer Reproved: being a Reply to the calumnious Charges of the Rev. C. A. MOYSEY, D. D. &c., in his late Bampton Lectures, against the Unitarians, and especially against the Editors of the Improved Version. In Letters to a Friend. To which will be annexed, A LETTER, in Reply to the Charges of the Very Reverend Dean MAGEE, in Vol. II. Part 2, of his 'Dissertations on Atonement and Sacrifice.' By THOMAS BELSHAM."

MR. HONE purposes to elucidate his forthcoming Enlarged Report of his Three Trials, by an abundance of additions, from materials of singular interest and rarity, with numerous coloured and other engravings and portraits, and various facsimiles, which will render it as acceptable to the curious collector, as to the general reader. The work is in forwardness, and will be printed in royal octavo, by subscription.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

A year has elapsed since the nation was in affliction for the loss of a deeply-regretted princess, and with her, the first of her womb and the hopes of the family. At the time, when the returning year brought the recollection of the past more strongly to our memory, death again struck his triumphant dart, and levelled with the dust one of the greatest men that this nation has produced. The loss was sensibly felt in every quarter; for though he was not in that high station, with which the generality are apt to connect so much consequence, yet his talents, his worth, and the honourable distinction with which he had been so lately invested, gave every one an interest in his character. In an honourable profession he had attained, by his own merit, that pre-eminence which merit only can confer: and as he had shewn himself to be the friend of the people and of the reform of abuses, the independent manner by which he was brought into parliament for the second city in the kingdom, led us to expect, that his voice would be more attended to in the senate of the nation. All things had conspired to render him the object of universal admiration and expectation, when he was taken from us in a most abrupt manner, and by a calamity, which points out to us the weakness of the highest intellect, and that in a moment the powers of the finest mind may be deranged. To fill up the place of such a man is not easy; and a more arduous task is imposed on the survivors, that they may perfect the plan which he had chalked out to them. The name of Sir Samuel Romilly will long be remembered by all, who knew him in his professional pursuits, or enjoyed with him the intercourse of private life; and by the public at large it will be held in honour, as long as true patriotism shall be in estimation in this country.

Another loss in higher life was expected from the warnings given by disease, and, at the age of the Queen, a long continuance among us was less to be expected. Her departure was attended with the usual marks of mourning attached to so high a personage, of whom it will become us to speak but little; but the decorum which she kept up in her court, and the discountenance which she held out to immoral

characters, at a time when it was not so easy to stem the torrent of fashionable vice, will, whenever her name is mentioned, be remembered highly to her advantage.—Time also will discover many traits of beneficence and benevolence, which would do honour to private characters, and, from their being performed without publicity and ostentation, entitle her the more to our respect. It may be matter of regret to observe, that imperfections are seized on with avidity; but who is free from them? It is for the advantage of the public, that moral worth, in high stations, should meet with its fair reward. The character of the great has considerable influence, and in no small degree may it perhaps be attributed to the royal personage whose loss is now deplored, that in the higher ranks of life more attention is paid in England to public decorum than in any other country in Europe.

The grand proceedings of Aix-la-Chapelle are not yet developed. The sovereigns have had their meeting, and discussed, without doubt, many points of great importance to their subjects. But we cannot think of their resolutions, whatever they may be, without recollecting that, in the same place, a solemn congress was held of the representatives of Europe, who laid the basis for perpetual amity between their sovereigns, which was overthrown in half a dozen years after. The present great men of the earth have, however, settled one point, namely, that France may be restored to her former state among the nations, that she requires no longer an armed force to secure the obedience of the subject to the sovereign, whom they have imposed upon her. In consequence, they have marched away their troops to their respective homes, and the warriors of England are landed in their country. Certain arrangements have also been made for the payment of sums, by France, to the respective countries, which have co-operated in placing her in her present state. Their farther regulations will, in due time, appear, and perhaps, will not be exactly the same, as if they had been drawn up by the representatives of their subjects.

It does not as yet appear, that they have interfered in the dispute between Bavaria

and Baden. Most probably they have settled the controversy, and assigned to each that territory, which may be presumed to be consistent with the dignity they obtained from Buonaparte, and what is a proper reward to them for quitting his service. Spain also seems not to have acquired any aid by this meeting, and, left to fight its own battles, will soon sink into the state due to its ill deserts; to that degradation, which is the proper reward of superstition and persecution.

France has finished its elections to supply the vacancies in its parliament, and from the tenour of them, it is evident, that the spirit of liberty is not lost in that country. The Marquis de la Fayette, who began his career of life in the cause of the independence of America, took a prominent part in the early stages of the Revolution, was confined a long time in the dungeons of Austria, and afterwards made one of the assembly in the hundred days' reign of Buonaparte, has been returned a representative to the parliament. This choice, which is by no means a singular one, indicates that the party of the Ultraroyalists is very much on its decline, and that it is now found expedient to govern by the principle of the Charter. In this case the French will have gained all that the best wishers of the Revolution desired in the beginning of it; and, if there is prudence in the government, that country may still enjoy the benefits of a good constitution. For, though their representation is not on the same principles as ours, yet it is not without very great advantages; and, if it can secure the liberty of the press, they may become, in no great length of time, the envy of their neighbours.

Germany is on the eve of seeing some important changes in its condition. That country is full of information, and the people seem inclined no longer to submit to their feudal dependence. From the nature of their governments, there is a great circulation of writings; for the different states do not combine together to keep the press in chains. All are looking to Prussia for the promised constitution, and by little and little, the people every where are rising in consideration. One great and important change is taking place, and that is, in the situation of the Jews, who used to be kept under by very degrading conditions. These are gradually giving way to better principles, and the Jews themselves, by superior attention to literature and science, are rising more and more in public estimation.

The Spanish colonies in America continue to be an object of great attention. The state of Buenos Ayres is beginning to claim its place among the legitimate governments. The Caraccas have not yet advanced so far towards their destined end. They find, however, employment for the adventurous spirits of this country, many of whom are expatriating themselves to fight under the banners of independence. The next important intelligence that is likely to be received, is from the western coast of America; and when Lima is taken, that part of the country may be considered as freed from the Spanish yoke.

The parliament of England is summoned to meet in the month of January. The death of the Queen made this necessary, and of course some new arrangements will take place, with respect to the care of our unhappy sovereign. Probably it will lead to somewhat more of economy, which may be consulted without injury to the royal personage, who is the object of these attentions. Whether any changes will take place in the ministry, are matters of mere surmise, but they are generally talked of.

Westminster, which has met with such a loss by the death of its beloved representative, has had a meeting to supply the vacancy. A candidate has appeared in the person of Mr. Hobhouse, son of Sir Benjamin Hobhouse, and it is not yet known whether any other will start on the popular side. The ministerial candidate at the last election has declared himself, and the contest is likely to be severe. Much depends on the union of the popular party, as they experienced at the last election; but it is often more difficult to unite parties, between whom there is little difference of opinion, than those who, one would think, would be the most violently opposed to each other.

In the new parliament, great questions are to be agitated. That of economy is not among the least important; that of reform in parliament will also be again discussed. What strength the cause of reform may have acquired by the change of members, time will shew; but apparently it can scarcely be so great as to shake the interest of the borough-holders. The debates, however, will continue to carry weight with them; and though the question may be dismissed by a majority of votes, yet this will not alter the public mind in its opinion, that the representation should be made conformable to the spirit of such a mode of government.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

A Letter to the Reverend the Clergy of both Universities concerning the Trinity and the Athanasian Creed: with a short Discourse concerning Mysteries, printed in the year 1694, and now (1817) reprinted from the Unitarian Tracts. 12mo. 1s.

Considerations on the alarming Increase of Forgery on the Bank of England, and the Causes which prevented the adoption of remedial Measures; with an Essay on the Remedy for the detection of Forgeries, and an Account of the Measures adopted by the Bank of Ireland. By Charles Wye Williams, Esq. 3s. 6d.

Biographical Conversations on the most eminent Voyagers of different Nations, from Columbus to Cooke. By W. Bingley. 12mo. 7s.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Benjamin Franklin, LL.D. F. R. S. Published by his Grandson, W. Temple Franklin. 3 vols. 4to. £4. 4s.

A Dictionary of the English Language, in which the Words are deduced from their Originals, and illustrated in their different Significations, by Examples from the best Writers; to which are prefixed, a History of the Language, and an English Grammar. By H. J. Todd, M. A. F. S. A. 4 vols. 4to. £11. 11s.

Elegy supposed to be written on a Field of Battle. Dedicated to the Peace Society.

Memoirs of the Public and Private Life of John Howard, the Philanthropist; compiled from his private Diary and Letters, the Journal of his confidential Attendant, the Communications of his Family and surviving Friends, and other authentic Sources of Information; most of it entirely original. By James Baldwin Brown, Esq. of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. 4to. Portraits. £2. 5s.

A Selection of Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship. Published by a Society of Unitarian Christians. Liverpool. 12mo. 6d.

A neat Edition of the Septuagint, with the Apocrypha, in one volume. The Text is taken from the Oxford Edition of Bos; same size as the Greek Testament. This edition is printed in one volume, for use in Churches and Chapels, as well as the Library. 8vo. £1. 8s.

The Greek Testament; a new edition: containing copious Notes from Hardy, Raphael, Kypke, Schleusner, Rosenmüller, &c., in familiar Latin: together with parallel Passages from the Classics, and with

references to Vigerus for Idioms, and Bos for Ellipses; 8vo edition, being the only one edited, (and intended for the use of the Student in Divinity as well as the Library,) by the Rev. E. Valpy, B. D.; Master of Norwich School, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich. 3 vols. £2. 12s. 6d. A few copies, large paper, price £4.

A Concordance to the Holy Bible; to which is added, a Geographical Index, with the Calendar and Table of Lessons; designed to accompany any quarto edition of the Bible, and adapted to the Maps and Notes of the Family Bible, published under the direction of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. Edited by James W. Bellamy, M. A.; Rector of the United Parishes of St. Mary Abchurch, and St. Laurence Pountney, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. In 4to. on Medium paper, price 4s., and on fine Royal paper, price 7s.

Speech of Lieutenant-General William Thornton, in the House of Commons, on Thursday, May 7, 1818, on his Motion to Repeal the Declarations against the Belief of Transubstantiation, and asserting the Worship of the Church of Rome to be Idolatrous; with Authorities and Illustrations, Deduction and Conclusion. 8vo. 6s.

A Narrative of a Journey of Five Thousand Miles through the Eastern and Western States of America, contained in Eight Reports, addressed to the Thirty-nine English Families, by whom the Author was deputed, in June, 1817, to ascertain whether any, and what Part of the United States would be suitable for their Residence: with Remarks on Mr. Birkbeck's Notes and Letters. By Henry Bradshaw Fearon. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Conversion of the World; or the Claims of Six Hundred Millions of Heathen, and the Ability and Duty of the Churches respecting them. By Gordon Hall and Samuel Newell, American Missionaries at Bombay. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

Life of James Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews, with an Account of his Death. By an Eye-witness.

Heming's Scripture Geography. Illustrated by a Set of Maps and a Chart of the World. Royal 4to. £3. 10s.

The Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, for the year 1818. 2s.

A Dissertation upon the Distinctions in Society, and Ranks of the People under the Anglo-Saxon Government. By Samuel Heywood. 8vo. 18s.

Expostulations on the Iniquity of the Spy System. By Jacob Bray. 2s. 6d.

A Journal of a Visit to South Africa, in the Years 1815 and 1816; with some Account of the Missionary Settlements of the United Brethren near the Cape of Good Hope. By the Rev. C. J. Lathrobe. 4to. Sixteen Engravings and a large Map. £2. 2s.

Faith in the Holy Trinity the Doctrine of the Gospel, and Sabellian Unitarianism shewn to be "the God-deuving Apostacy." In a connected Series of Letters. By William Hales, D. D. Rector of Killesandra, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 1s. Second edition, corrected and enlarged.

Hymns selected from various Authors, and chiefly intended for the Instruction of Young Persons. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

Winter Evenings, or Tales of Travellers. By Maria Hack. 4 vols. 18mo. 10s. half-bound.

Sermons. (In Volumes.)

On the First Lessons of the Sunday Morning Service, from the First to the Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, together with Four Sermons on other Subjects. By R. Burrowes, D. D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Sermons, in which the Connexion is traced between the Belief and the Character, Comfort and Prospects of Christians. By Miles Jackson, Minister of St. Paul's, Leeds. 8vo. 12s.

Sermons, from the Manuscripts of the late C. Moore, M. A. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 1s.

The Church Catechism and Rite of Confirmation explained in a Course of Lectures. By Thomas Tunstall, B. D. 13s.

Sermons, by the late E. Robson, A. M. Vicar of Orston, and Lecturer of St. Mary, Whitechapel: selected and published under the Patronage of H. R. H. the Prince Regent, for the Benefit of the Author's Family. By H. C. O'Donnoghue, A. M. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 1s.

(Single.)

The Present State of Parties in England Represented and Improved; delivered in Essex Street Chapel, and Renshaw Street, Liverpool. By Thomas Belsham. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Principles of Unitarian Christians: preached before an Association at Hull, September 29, 1818. By John Platts. 12mo. 1s.

Faith, its Value, Nature, and proper Fruits, according to the Scriptures, and the good old Principles of the Church of England. By Richard Warner, late Curate of St. James's Parish, Bath. 6d.

Peace and Edification the objects of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: preached in the Parish Church of St. Philip, Birmingham, June 30, 1818. By R. Nares, M. A. Archdeacon of Stafford, &c. 1s. 6d.

Bartholomew Day Commemorated; Delivered at the Meeting House in Dean Street, Southwark, August 24, 1818. By J. M. Cramp. 1s.

The Christian Ministry an Office of Labour: Preached at Broadmead, Bristol, at the Annual Meeting of the Bristol Education Society, August 5, 1818. By Thomas Steffe Crisp.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. R. Awbrey; G. Kenrick; H. Taylor; J. Jevons; Joseph Cornish; James Manning; W. Johnston; J. H. Bransby; R. Fry; Joseph Hunter, and Drs. Carpenter and T. S. Smith; R. F.; R. S.; Inquirer; a Friend to Truth; An Occasional Reader; A New Subscriber; A.; P.; I. A.; E. T.; J. J.; T. M. and Pamphilus.

The "Three Essays on Predestination," mentioned by *Philalethes*, have not yet been received. Several packets sent from the Country, by private hand, have, we understand, been lost.

Various Articles of Review, Obituary and Intelligence, which have been some time ready for the press, are unavoidably postponed. Our Correspondents will bear in mind, that Articles belonging to the Present Volume must, as far as is practicable, be brought into the next Number, which, on account of the *Indexes*, will be printed earlier in the month than usual.

ERRATA.

In the last Number, p. 649, the Poem, entitled *Heaven*, should have been quoted as from Moore's "Sacred Songs." There are two errors in the copy from which we printed, viz.

Second Stanza, fourth line, for "from," read *for*.

Third Stanza, second line, for "are," read *we're*.